

DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

"OPEN THY MOUTH FOR THE DUMB, IN THE CAUSE OF ALL SUCH AS ARE APPOINTED TO DESTRUCTION; OPEN THY MOUTH, JUDGE RIGHTEOUSLY, AND PLEAD THE CAUSE OF THE POOR AND NEEDY."—1st Eccl. xxxi. 8, 9.

VOLUME III. }
NUMBER VII. }

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1860.

PRICE—
ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT NUMBER.

Equal Suffrage Defeated.....	369
Dr. Cheever in Glasgow.....	369
The Late Election.....	370
The Question of Amalgamation.....	371
Seventh Annual Clam Bake.....	372
White Folks Down in Hayti.....	373
Speech of Rev. Dr. Cheever at Glasgow.....	574
Annual Address at the Jerry Rescue Celebration, by Rev. S. J. May.....	377
Speech of John Hossack at Chicago.....	380
Southern Thunder.....	381
Advertisements.....	384

DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE DEFEATED.

The late election, so far as the State of New York is concerned, has features of discouragement, as well as the opposite. The disposition made of the question of Equal Suffrage was inconsistent with every profession and principle of the triumphant party, and must surprise the enemies of equal rights as much as it certainly disappoints the expectations of colored citizens, who supposed that this constitutional brand of inferiority (by which colored men must have two hundred and fifty dollars of real property before they can vote, while all others vote on their simple manhood) would be erased from the organic law, which it has so long disgraced, simultaneously with the triumph of the great Republican party. All parties had reason to believe this would be done, if the State were not carried for Fusion or the slavery party. It would have been done had faith in its principles equalled the declarations of the members of the Republican party. They professed to believe in the Declaration of American Independence, and inserted the fundamental principle of equality which it contains, into their platform of principles at Chicago, but deserted that principle at the first moment they were called upon to give it life and form in the fundamental law of the State.—Had the Republican party been as true to the sacred cause of liberty and equality, as the Democratic party always proves itself to slavery and oppression, the invidious and odious discrimination against our equal citizenship would have been blotted out, and the colored voters of the State would have had some reason for the enthusiasm with which they have shouted their praises of the Republican party. While the Democrats at the polls never failed to accompany their State and national tickets with one against the proposed amendment, Republicans—many of them—refused to touch a ticket in favor of the amendment, and this, too, while white men, native and foreign, were brought to the polls so drunk, that they needed support on both sides while depositing their votes, and whose only political principle seemed to be injustice to the negro. We know whereof we affirm, for we stood at the polls all day, doing our best for Equal Suffrage.

The moral effect of this defeat of justice and equality will be to fix more deeply in the

public mind the popular contempt and scorn with which the rights and feelings of colored citizens are regarded, and invite their brutal manifestations wherever the colored man appears. For when men degrade and oppress the weak, every act of that character tends to strengthen the malignant motive which incites to such action. The vote on the property qualification is in its nature a re-affirmation of the slavery-engendered contempt for the rights of black men, and is a fresh license to all who are mean enough (and their name is legion) to insult the man of color wherever they meet him. They are men who are brave enough to trip up a man on crutches, push a blind man off the side-walk, or flog a man when his hands are tied, but too base and cowardly to contend with one who has an equal chance of defense with themselves. The black man, excluded alike from the jury box and the ballot box, is at the mercy of his enemies. The blow is a heavy and damaging one.—Every intelligent colored man must feel it keenly. It was given without any rational cause. No decent man could assign a motive for his vote against us, without casting his eyes to the ground, or looking up with a blush of mingled shame and malice. Not even the desire to stand well with the South could be pleaded. All knew that the election of LINCOLN would destroy all the conciliating power which this new injustice to the negro might exert in that quarter, so that even this base and contemptible motive could not be pleaded. No, it was an act of unmitigated pride and prejudice, intended to depress and degrade a class which, of all others in the State, need the ballot box as a means of self-elevation and popular regard. Had the colored people been a large and powerful body in the State, it might, with some show of reason, been contended that they would become controlling if allowed to vote on equal terms with others; but any pretense of this kind would have stamped the objector as a fool. Every body knew that the scattered colored population of the State, voting wherever their interest or conscience might lead, would in no wise affect harmfully the policy of the State. We do not even wring from this vote the poor consolation that any body was afraid of our influence or power. The victory over us is simply one of blind ignorance and prejudice, hardly less destitute of manly intelligence than the kick of an ass. It was the vote of drunken Irishmen, and ignorant Dutchmen, controlled by sham Democrats, whose Democracy consists not in equal and exact justice to all, but in the right of brute power to trample upon the weak and defenceless. We saw the kind of men by whom the deed was done in Rochester. They were the tools of the negro-hating Democracy of this city, many of whom would sell their votes for a glass of whiskey. It is impossible to feel degraded by injustice from such a quarter.

But what will the colored people and their friends do now that the day has gone against

them? Will the question of Equal Suffrage be allowed to sleep? We trust not. Our opponents need hope for no such thing. Our cause is just, wise, and proper, and must not be dropped. We are defeated rather by the supineness of our friends, than by the strength and activity of our enemies. We were overshadowed and smothered by the Presidential struggle—over laid by ABRAHAM LINCOLN and HANNIBAL HAMLIN. The black baby of Negro Suffrage was thought too ugly to exhibit on so grand an occasion. The negro was stowed away like some people put out of sight their deformed children when company comes. We were told by some of our Republican friends to keep still—make no noise—they would do the work. Now, the fox is out of the well, and the goat is in it. Cunning dogs, you are not done with us yet. We are going to follow you as the woman followed the unjust judge. You must and will eventually settle this question, and all others in respect to the colored people of this State, in harmony with the great principles at the basis of the American Government—the professed principles of the great Republican party of the State and nation.

DR. CHEEVER IN GLASGOW.

We need not commend to our readers the proceedings of this meeting, and the eloquent and powerful address of Dr. CHEEVER. They will be read by all with profound interest.—The names of the gentlemen who graced the platform by their presence are and among the most distinguished in Scotland. Sincerely are we glad to observe the decided and fearless tone in which Mr. BATCHELOR speaks of Dr. CHEEVER and his mission. Glasgow, tho' unsurpassed for the depth and earnestness of its anti-slavery sentiment, has been a little tardy in committing itself to the cause and course of Dr. CHEEVER. Now that she has seen and heard the man for herself, no community, we think, will surpass her in responding to the claims of this earnest and faithful apostle of liberty and humanity for the dumb millions trodden under the iron heel of slavery in this professed Christian country.—Whatever may be the criticisms by American journals on the character and course of Dr. CHEEVER, our trans-Atlantic friends and readers may depend upon it, for we know the men—Dr. CHEEVER's faithfulness in exposing the iniquity of slavery, and his fearless denunciations of those in church and state who uphold the abomination, is his greatest offense. They hate him because he tells them the truth.

EMIGRATION TO HAYTI.—The first vessel sent by the Haytian Bureau of Emigration, will sail from Boston on the 22d of December next, the anniversary of the departure of President Geffard from Port-au-Prince, to begin the Revolution, which terminated in the establishment of the Republic of Hayti. A large number of passengers have been engaged.

THE LATE ELECTION.

Our last monthly paper announced the probable election of ABRAHAM LINCOLN and HANNIBAL HAMLIN, the Republican candidates for President and Vice President of the U. S. What was then only speculation and probability, is now an accomplished fact. Pennsylvania, in her State election of October, it is true, had made this result, to a degree, certain; but there were efforts and appliances resorted to by the enemies of the Republican party, which could not fail to cause doubt and anxiety in the minds of the most sanguine.—The deed is, however, now done, and a new order of events connected with the great question of slavery, is now fairly opening upon the country, the end whereof the most sagacious and far-sighted are unable to see and declare. No preceding election resembles this in its issues and parties, and none resembles it in the effects it has already produced, and is still likely to produce. It was a contest between sections, North and South, as to what shall be the principles and policy of the national Government in respect to the slave system of the fifteen Southern States. The broadest assertion of a right of property in man, holding such property equally innocent, sacred and legal under the Constitution, as property in houses, lands, horses, sheep, and horned cattle, and like the latter entitled to Congressional protection in all the Territories, and by parity of reasoning, in all the States of the American Union. The Southern candidate for the Presidency, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, fully represented this broad assertion of what Lord MANSFIELD well declared to be so opposed to nature, that nothingshort of positive law could support it, and BROUGHAM denounced as the 'wild and guilty fantasy' of property in man. Mr. LINCOLN, the Northern Republican candidate, while admitting the right to hold men as slaves in the States already existing, regards such property as peculiar, exceptional, local, generally an evil, and not to be extended beyond the limits of the States where it is established by what is called positive law. We thus simply state the issue, more for the benefit of our trans-Atlantic friends and readers, than for those at home, who have heard and read little else during the last three or four months. The clamor now raised by the slaveholders about 'Northern aggression,' 'sectional warfare,' as a pretext of dissolving the Union, has this basis only: The Northern people have elected, against the opposition of the slaveholding South, a man for President who declared his opposition to the further extension of slavery over the soil belonging to the United States. Such is the head and front, and the full extent of the offense, for which 'minute men' are forming, drums are beating, flags are flying, people are arming, 'barks are closing,' 'stocks are falling,' and the South generally taking on dreadfully.

By referring to another part of our present monthly, our respected readers will find a few samples of the spirit of the Southern press on the subject. They are full of intrigue, smell of brimstone, and betoken a terrific explosion. Unquestionably, 'secession,' 'disunion,' 'Southern Confederacy,' and the like phrases, are the most popular political watch words of the cotton-growing States of the Union. Nor is this sentiment to be entirely despised. If Mr. LINCOLN were really

an Abolition President, which he is not; if he were a friend to the Abolition movement, instead of being, as he is, its most powerful enemy, the dissolution of the Union might be the only effective mode of perpetuating slavery in the Southern States—since if it could succeed, it would place slavery beyond the power of the President and his Government. But the South has now no such cause for disunion. The present alarm and perturbation will cease; the Southern fire-eaters will be appeased, and will retrace their steps.—There is no sufficient cause for the dissolution of the Union. Whoever lives through the next four years will see Mr. LINCOLN and his Administration attacked more bitterly for their pro-slavery truckling, than for doing any anti-slavery work. He and his party will become the best protectors of slavery where it now is, and just such protectors as slaveholders will most need. In order to defeat him, the slaveholders took advantage of the ignorance and stupidity of the masses, and assured them that LINCOLN is an Abolitionist. This, Mr. LINCOLN and his party will lose no time in scattering to the winds as false and groundless. With the single exception of the question of slavery extension, Mr. LINCOLN proposes no measure which can bring him into antagonistic collision with the traffickers in human flesh, either in the States or in the District of Columbia. The Union will, therefore, be saved simply because there is no cause in the election of Mr. LINCOLN for its dissolution. Slavery will be as safe, and safer, in the Union under such a President, than it can be under any President of a Southern Confederacy. This is our impression, and we deeply regret the facts from which it is derived.

With an Abolition President we should consider a successful separation of the slave from the free States a calamity, greatly damaging to the prospects of our long enslaved, bruised and mutilated people; but under what may be expected of the Republican party, with its pledges to put down the slaves should they attempt to rise, and to hunt them should they run away, a dissolution of the Union would be highly beneficial to the cause of liberty.—The South would then be a Sicily, and the North a Sardinia. Mr. LINCOLN would then be entirely absolved from his slave-hunting, slave-catching and slave-killing pledges, and the South would have to defend slavery with her own guns, and hunt her negroes with her own dogs. In truth, we really wish those brave, fire-eating, cotton-growing States would just now go at once outside the Union and set up for themselves, where they could be got at without disturbing other people, and got away from without encountering other people. Such a consummation was 'one devoutly to be wished.' But no, cunning dogs, they will smother their rage, and after all the dust they can raise, they will retire within the Union and claim its advantages.

What, then, has been gained to the anti-slavery cause by the election of Mr. LINCOLN? Not much, in itself considered, but very much when viewed in the light of its relations and bearings. For fifty years the country has taken the law from the lips of an exacting, haughty and imperious slave oligarchy. The masters of slaves have been the masters of the Republic. Their authority was almost undisputed, and their power irre-

sistible. They were the President makers of the Republic, and no aspirant dared to hope for success against their frown. LINCOLN's election has vitiated their authority, and broken their power. It has taught the North its strength, and shown the South its weakness. More important still, it has demonstrated the possibility of electing, if not an Abolitionist, at least an *anti-slavery reputation* to the Presidency of the United States. The years are few since it was thought possible that the Northern people could be wrought up to the exercise of such startling courage. Hitherto the threat of disunion has been as potent over the politicians of the North, as the cat-o'-nine-tails is over the backs of the slaves. Mr. LINCOLN's election breaks this enchantment, dispells this terrible night mare, and awakes the nation to the consciousness of new powers, and the possibility of a higher destiny than the perpetual bondage to an ignoble fear.

Another probable effect will be to extinguish the reviving fires of the accursed foreign slave trade, which for a year or two have been kindled all along the Southern coast of the Union. The Republican party is under no necessity to pass laws on this subject. It has only to enforce and execute the laws already on the statute book. The moral influence of such prompt, complete and unflinching execution of the laws, will be great, not only in arresting the specific evil, but in arresting the tide of popular demoralization with which the successful prosecution of the horrid trade in naked men and women was overspreading the country. To this duty the Republican party will be prompted, not only by the conscience of the North, but by what perhaps will be more controlling party interests.

It may also be conceded that the election of LINCOLN and HAMLIN, notwithstanding the admission of the former that the South is entitled to an efficient Fugitive Slave Law, will render the practice of recapturing and returning to slavery persons who have heroically succeeded, or may hereafter succeed in reaching the free States, more unpopular and odious, than it would have been had either DOUGLAS, BELL or BRECKINRIDGE been elected. Slaves may yet be hunted, caught and carried back to slavery, but the number will be greatly diminished, because of the popular disinclination to execute the cruel and merciless Fugitive Slave Law. Had LINCOLN been defeated, the fact would have been construed by slaveholders, and their guilty minions of the country, as strong evidence of the soundness of the North in respect to the alleged duty of hounding down and handing over the panting fugitive to the vengeance of his infuriated master. No argument is needed to prove this gain to the side of freedom.

But chief among the benefits of the election, has been the canvass itself. Notwithstanding the many cowardly disclaimers, and miserable concessions to popular prejudice against the colored people, which Republican orators have felt themselves required, by an intense and greedy desire of success, to make, they have been compelled also to recur to first principles of human liberty, expose the baseless claim of property in man, exhibit the hideous features of slavery, and to unveil, for popular execration, the brutal manners and morals of the guilty slave-masters.—The canvass has sent all over the North

most learned and eloquent men to utter the great truths which Abolitionists have for twenty years been earnestly, but unsuccessfully endeavoring to get before the public mind and conscience. We may rejoice in the dissemination of the truth by whomsoever proclaimed, for the truth will bear its own weight, and bring forth its own fruit.

Nevertheless, this very victory threatens and may be the death of the modern Abolition movement, and finally bring back the country to the same, or a worse state, than BENJ. LUNNY and WM. LLOYD GARRISON found it thirty years ago. The Republican party does not propose to abolish slavery any where, and is decidedly opposed to Abolition agitation. It is not even, by the confession of its President elect, in favor of the repeal of that thrice-accursed and flagrantly unconstitutional Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850. It is plain to see, that once in power, the policy of the party will be only to seem a little less yielding to the demands of slavery than the Democratic or Fusion party, and thus render ineffective and pointless the whole Abolition movement of the North. The safety of our movement will be found only by a return to all the agencies and appliances, such as writing, publishing, organizing, lecturing, holding meetings, with the earnest aim not to prevent the extension of slavery, but to abolish the system altogether. Congress should be at once memorialized for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the slave trade between the States. The same zeal, activity, energy and earnestness should be displayed in circulating petitions, as in the earlier stages of the movement. We have the pen, voice and influence of only one man, and that man of the most limited class; but with few or many, in whatever vicissitudes which may surround the cause, now or hereafter, we shall join in no cry, and unite in no demand less than the complete and universal abolition of the whole slave system. Slavery shall be destroyed.

DEATH OF MISS JANE PORTER—Since the publication of our last monthly paper, we have been called to the grave of one of the most amiable, truest and most intelligent of the circle of our anti-slavery friends in Rochester, Miss JANE PORTER, sister to the much esteemed Treasurer of the Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society. The deceased was early in her benevolent efforts to promote the elevation of our oppressed and neglected people. Being apt to teach, and justly esteeming education as the great source of social improvement, she many years ago taught colored children in Philadelphia, a city where prejudice against color is most intense and bitter. What she did in that city she also did here before the colored school was abolished. She was never ashamed to be known as the friend to the negro. Cut down in the midst of her years and usefulness, removed from a large circle of those who had shared the advantages of her industry, application and high attainments as a teacher, called away from a group of sisters to whom she was especially dear, her death is deeply lamented by many families outside of those of her immediate relations.

—The latest returns from California and Oregon indicate that both States have gone for Lincoln—thus giving him every free State.

THE QUESTION OF AMALGAMATION.

C. P. COONLY, READING, MASS.—DEAR FRIEND DAVIS: I desire to ask you a few questions on the subject of Mongrels—"concrete men"—such for instance as Frederick Douglass, Wm. Wells Brown, &c., &c. 1st. Does not the amalgamation of Negro and White produce in all things, (physical stamina included,) an inferior race? 2d. Is it possible to perfectly hybridize the two species? In the Mulatto is not the union incomplete, or do the two bloods perfectly blend? Can a Mulatto ever get above "halfness?"

ANSWER: There is a spiritual geometry in the forms of the constituents of blood. It is our impression that physiologists and chemists have the best things yet to discover in the life-secrets of the human heart. In our medical department we shall one day bring out the results of our investigations, and will therefore, in this answer, confine our remarks only to the great general facts underlying the visible fluid.

First: The spermatozoa of the male and female of any nation will not perfectly blend, unless the shape of the blood-particles be consistent with the imperative requirements of the masculine and feminine principles.

Second: The most perfect blending occurs in the harmonious conjunction of healthy males and females of the same general type of species—as two Grecians, two Mongolians, two Africans, two Americans, &c.—showing that the best offspring are obtained from parents of exactly opposite temperaments, but of the same species or nationality.

Third: But the shape of the blood's particles is interiorly different and uncongenial, consequently, in parents of exactly opposite nationalities; although in the matter of temperament they may be organized in a similar manner, by virtue of which they may be organized in a similar manner, by virtue of which they may be fitted for all the requirements and advantages of Brotherhood.

Fourth: Therefore, it will forever remain physiologically impossible to perfectly—i. e. harmoniously and conjugally—blend or hybridize the reproductive blood of extreme nationalities. Let it be observed that we use the word 'extreme' nationally, because when the White and Black are not exactly opposite, the offspring may be considerably perfect, both physically and mentally. The reproductive qualities of Greece, for illustration, could not affinitize with those of America. Proof: The development of various g.-betweens, or intermediates, and conductors—through much time and space—so that American blood might at length exist, and triumphantly prevail. Anglo-Saxonism in us is rapidly departing. Americans are imperceptibly growing like the aboriginal inhabitants of the continent.

Fifth, and lastly: It will likewise remain physiologically impossible to obtain permanently happy and progressive offspring from the external conjugation (or marriage) of full-blooded America with full-blooded Africa.—But partial blood may coalesce. Amalgamation, therefore, cannot be practiced with impunity.—The children of all incompatible blood-globules will exhibit, both by the disposition of character and habitual conduct, the angular particles which (unaffinitized) circulate in their veins and brain.

The scientific reasons for the above conclusions we shall ere long submit to the lovers of truth. Of course, in these conclusions, we utter not a word respecting inferiority or superiority; so that no human soul need suffer depression or experience elevation.—Herald of Progress.

There is a great deal of nonsense afloat like the above, which but for the prevalence of blind prejudice, and a baseless pride of race, kept alive by the existence of slavery in one half of the American Union, would pass under its true designation, and excite only the contempt it deserves. Slavery, however, is able to exalt nonsense and stupidity into the dignity of learning and philosophy. Twenty hundred millions of dollars invested in the blood and bones of the colored race, is able to offer, in the shape of popularity, a standing bribe, a perpetual temptation to so-called philosophers and scientific pretenders to use their powers to disparage and degrade the hated and enslaved race. The questions raised by Mr. C. P. COONLY, of Reading, Mass., with such

grave and philosophic precision, and answered so mystically by Mr. ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS, respect the 'wholeness' of the white man, and the 'halfness' of such specimens of humanity as WM. WELLS BROWN and FREDERICK DOUGLASS. As one of the subjects of this physical metaphysical, spiritual and social inquiry, we may be allowed at least a 'half' word on one half the subject, leaving the other half to be disposed of by the 'whole' men—such as Mr. COONLY, of Reading, Mass., and Mr. DAVIS, of the Herald of Progress.

We take for granted that Mr. COONLY (whatever doubts his name might suggest) is, indeed, a 'whole' man—has four fingers and one thumb on each hand—lives on cooked food—knows the use of fire—drinks water or whiskey, as he likes best—walks on two legs, like any other man or goose—has two elbows, one nose, two whole eyes, and one head—laughs when he is tickled—weeps when he is sorrowful—lies down when he sleeps—and in a word, is really subject to all the weaknesses and infirmities, and possesses all the dignity, power and intelligence of any other 'whole' man. If this be so, he is a good criterion by which to test the ability of a mulatto. We are ready for him. Let him suggest the time when, the place where, and the things to be done by a white 'whole' man, and a mulatto 'half' man. Suppose we take 'physical stamina' first. That is easily tested, either by lifting iron weights, or eating rattlesnakes. How many pounds can you lift, Mr. COONLY? Whatever may be the exact amount, we will bind ourselves to find a mulatto—a 'half' man—who will lift and carry more than half as much. We can promise but little as to the rattlesnakes; nevertheless, if you can eat and digest a whole rattlesnake, without injury to your 'physical stamina,' we bind ourselves to find a mulatto who can do pretty nearly as well. We are willing to match you at chopping cord wood, hoeing corn, digging potatoes, plowing, reaping, walking, running, swinging, swimming, or flinging! The 'half' man shall ask no odds of the 'whole' man at any one of these tests of 'physical stamina.' He will bind himself to stand as much heat and cold, wet and dry, and hard work, as any 'whole' white man Mr. COONLY may select. Come on, COONLY. How long does it take a 'whole' white man to grow? Very well; the mulatto is even with you there; he, too, is a man at twenty-one or two. How tall does he grow? Yes; there we are even too, for we have seen mulattoes full six feet four inches. How much does he weigh? Very well; there, too, there is not much difference between the 'half' and the 'whole.' Two hundred is quite a common weight for a mulatto. How long does a 'whole' man live? Well said; we have seen several mulattoes over an hundred years old, and doing well. How many 'whole' white men did you ever see who were over two hundred years? So we thought. Dr. PARR came nearest to that figure, and he came short of it by forty-eight years. There are other tests of 'physical stamina'; but we need not specify them here, taking it for granted that if the 'half' so nearly resembles the 'whole' in the points already suggested, they cannot differ very widely at other points which are nearly allied to them.

We come now to 'moral stamina.' Name the virtue we cannot practice, and name the

crime we cannot commit. If a 'whole' white man cannot practice the one and perpetrate the other, the 'half' man cannot; but if the white man can, the mulatto can. We need not here cite instances or cases; just run over the list, Mr. COONLY, at your leisure, and find those vices and crimes which 'whole' white men have been known to commit, and which the 'halfness' men cannot. For our part, we know not one; but perhaps you do. On the other hand, please refer to those high moral actions, requiring strong convictions of duty for performance, and we will, according to our numbers and opportunity, endeavor to match the 'whole' by the 'half' at that point. The truth is, humanity is ever the same. When Britons were barbarians, they behaved very much like barbarians of other colors; and when they became enlightened, they behaved like civilized men. To get the simple truth on the subject needs nothing but a few grains of common sense—yes, common sense, Mr. COONLY.

As to the other branch, the relative mental power of the 'halfs' and the 'wholes,' we are as much at ease as in respect to the two other points already settled. We have seen a good many white fools, and some mulatto ones. On the other hand, we have met many of an opposite description, both whites and mulattoes. We now have in our mind three or four of the latter class, who, for magical quickness of apprehension, solid reasoning faculties, valuable intellectual acquisitions in languages, living and dead, we are prepared to match against one in every thousand of the white race, whatever may have been their educational advantages. We are ready even to have these mulatto gentlemen confronted by the learned and astute Mr. COONLY, and abide the result. But our patience with this miserable effort to cast a stigma upon a class already weighed down by oppression and wrong, in a paper calling itself the '*Herald of Progress*,' is now quite exhausted, and we leave Mr. COONLY to digest the dish already served up for his palate. But for the impertinence of calling us by name, the matter might have been permitted to go its round of geometrical dreaminess undisturbed. 'Answer a fool according to his folly.'

HOW CAN SLAVERY BE ABOLISHED?—A call for a Convention, to be held in Boston, December 3d, at Tremont Temple, has been issued by a number of young men of that city, for the purpose of discussing this important question. The speakers—among whom are Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith, Montgomery Blair, R. W. Emerson, Rev. Mr. Wheeler, and Frederick Douglass—will be confined to the question, as the Committee think it would be a work of supererogation to defend John Brown now, and a useless waste of time to eulogize him, and they wish to continue his life by striving to accomplish what he left them to finish.

REVELATIONS OF A SLAVE SMUGGLER.—We have received from the publisher, Robert M. De Witt, New York, a copy of this thrilling book, which has been noticed so extensively by the press throughout the North. We have not room in our present number to give it the notice it deserves, but we will in some future issue give some extracts. Price 25 cents.

ANOTHER TRUE FRIEND GONE.—Just as we go to press we have received a letter containing the sad intelligence that Mr. H. O. Remington, of New Bedford, is now no more.

THE SEVENTH ANNUAL CLAM BAKE.

The *Anglo-African* has laid us and its readers generally under special obligation for its entertaining history of the Annual Clam Bake. Woeful and sad is the condition of a race when its heart for amusement is gone. Its future will be short, as well as gloomy. We like to study our people at play as well as at prayer. They were at play at Fort Lee, and the occasion was instructive as well as brilliant.—Prejudice against color and fine spun theories, elaborated by the NOTTS and GLIDDONS, and other American ethnological pro-slavery writers, would have found on this occasion irresistible evidence of the vitality, progress, intelligence, and wealth of the colored people of this country. No man could have viewed the scene at Fort Lee without receiving favorable impressions of the people. It was a picture of order, elegance and beauty, and of whole-souled good-feeling, such as we cannot too often witness, and filled us with hope for the future of our race. The *Anglo* says:

Appetite has surfeited upon the season's ripe harvest of fruits and berries, and now stripping off her dainty garments as the fall winds are stripping the green leaves from orchard and grove, she dives to the sandy depths of the briny water, and feeds her fancy upon clams. Novelty, novelty is the stimulus of our natures, and now and then superior genius displays her transcendent power, creating from things insignificant and uncared for, a beauty and a history.

In 1853, Mr. Peter A. Williams of Brooklyn, N. Y., conceived the idea of a rural entertainment in the shape of a clam bake, and in co-operation with Mr. John Thompson of Fall River, the suggestion was carried out, and the first grand rural banquet was celebrated in that neighborhood. The truly novel and convivial character of this entertainment, owing to its ingenious management, stamped it at once a popular and indispensable feature in the fashionable enjoyments of the season, and a club was formed, we believe, the first in New York, under the name of the New York Clam Bake Association. Their festivals have been regularly observed since this organization, respectively in Fall River, Carville, Weehawken, Boston and the 7th at Fort Lee on Wednesday, Sept. 26th, 1860.

The mere announcement of this period was the signal for the greatest enthusiasm in the lively circles. The evening previous brought with it brilliant hosts from the east, west, north and south.

At 11 o'clock on the morning of the 26th, the steamer left her dock foot of Spring street, and turned her head toward Fort Lee in as grand a sunlight as ever gilded the face of the beautiful Hudson. But lo! whilst Massachusetts grasps, in friendly greeting, the hand of New York, or the fair daughter of Rhode Island receives the graceful compliments of the assembled company, (not forgetting her lord,) a form arises towering head and shoulders over the whole company, it is Frederick Douglass, thenceforth as ever the lion of the occasion.

The boat made her landing at 12 o'clock precisely, and the ladies were escorted to the pavilion a few rods from the water, where every convenience had been made for their comfort. An elevated platform with canvass awning, afforded a grand promenade, and Professor Brown soon found work for idle feet to do. The spot was well selected. The excellent position of the platform gave us the full benefit of the refreshing breeze from the water and afforded a magnificent view from the opposite shore. When the comfort of the guests had been properly attended to, the President turned his attention to the bake, which was the feature of the occasion. A number of square stones were heated upon a pile of wood arranged in a hollow square.—When the smoke had died away, a layer of

sea-weed was spread upon the stones, then the clams in an immense quantity, were poured from barrels, next sliced potatoes, and then followed green corn, onions, and bass done up in cloths. The whole were covered with a canvass sheet, and in twenty minutes the bake was ready. During the process of the bake, a side arrangement with a suspicious looking pot was carefully nursed by the President, until claims had lost their charms, when the lid was removed and odors rich and rare vied with the perfumes of the sweet flowers which decked the surrounding green. Ochre chicken formed the cap stone to the pyramid of this culinary arrangement, and the party retired to the dance. They were not long destined to linger here however, for a well spread table in doors soon claimed their attention, after which the hours were made merry in the indulgence of happy greetings of kindred spirits, long separated but never forgotten.

A beautiful incident during the day, was the presentation to the president of a silver clam shell by the Boston clam bake association. The shell bears the inscription of the donors, with the coat of arms of the State of Massachusetts. The presentation was made by Mr. G. T. Downing in a most graceful speech, and responded to in a neat manner by the President. Mr. Douglass also addressed the company in behalf of the guests from abroad, and at 8 o'clock the curtain fell over this beautiful re-union, and reluctantly we turned our faces homeward.

We noticed present from Boston, Mrs. J. Lockly Marshall and daughter, John B. Bailey and two daughters, Benj. Gregory and lady, Thomas G. Williams, E. Howard, C. Lennox, J. Colson, J. Freeman, G. Sewell, G. Ruffin, J. Selden, Wm. Jarvis and lady; New Bedford, Mrs. Remington, Mrs. Chapman, Mrs. Perry; Newport, George I. Downing, wife and daughter, Mrs. Willis; Washington, R. Booker; Baltimore, William Jones; Harrisburgh, J. F. Williams and lady; Newark, Anthony James and lady; Philadelphia, Thomas J. Bowers and lady, Thomas J. Dorsey and lady, Edward James; N. Y. Association, Peter Williams and lady, Robert Vosburgh and lady, William H. Thompson and lady, Daniel Brooks and lady, J. Bowers and lady, Thomas McKeil, George M. Francis and lady, Henry Preston, Wesley Earle and lady; Hartford, Thos. Saunders and Mrs. Prince Saunders.

Before the company had separated, a little 'billet deaux' was passed into certain hands reading thus: 'Mrs. Vosburgh, at home on Thursday 27th, from 12 M. to 3 P. M.' This was the index to a most polished and sumptuous entertainment—at 6 o'clock the company retired to enjoy the hospitality of Mr. Peter Williams, from thence to New York, where Mr. Charles Taylor had his table spread in honor of the guests.

Friday evening a grand ball, where beauty and fashion overwhelmed the very sight in the dazzling grandeur.

Saturday evening an entertainment by Mrs. Bowers, and Monday evening a most magnificent banquet by Mrs. Peter Williams of Brooklyn.

The epicurean art will not suffer in the hands of her skillful lord, nor do we believe the links of social brotherhood so inseparably rivetted by his towering genius and generous impulse can fail to hold now and forever the east, west, north and south, heart in heart, and hand in hand, in sentiment one and inseparable.

TYPES.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY.—The December number of this popular monthly is before us, and with it ends the sixth volume. Without exception, it is the best monthly periodical issued from the American press. Among its contributors are such names as Mrs. Stowe, Longfellow, Hawthorne, Holmes, Lowell, Emerson, Whittier, Bayard Taylor, Sargent, Higginson and Chas. Reed. Its price is \$3 per annum; but we have made arrangements so that we can send this magazine and our own paper to any person sending us a new subscriber and \$3.

WHITE FOLKS DOWN IN HAYTI.

Translated from the original MSS. of Ad. Ackermann for Douglass' Monthly.

The whites in the Republic of Hayti are composed chiefly of merchants and their clerks, with some servants, a limited number of Professors of Mathematics and of Languages, and a few artisans, as bakers and shoemakers. The whole number of them may be estimated at four hundred, of whom two hundred reside in Port-au-Prince.

Let it be understood that we do not speak of the Representatives of France, England, and Spain, which powers maintain diplomatic agents in Port-au-Prince, who form the best society of the capital. Other nations have their consuls and vice-consuls, chosen among resident merchants; but these agents, being for commercial purposes only, and having no diplomatic character, are not required to possess extensive educational qualifications.

In short, nine-tenths of the whites are occupied in business, and their relations with Haytians are merely with the residents of the principal towns; for a white man is not allowed to engage in retail trade, but only wholesale—'gros or demi-gros.' Germans, French, a few Englishmen, fewer Spaniards and Italians, compose this number. Americans are about as numerous as Englishmen; Germans generally prevail in number.

No social circle of white men exist in Port-au-Prince. There is not a single association of any kind among them—no reading-room, no club—literally nothing of the kind. This may astonish the reader; but let us tell how it comes.

Europeans who go to this country are generally young clerks, who have learned only just what they must in order to be merchants. Rarely an uncolored person of ability remains in Hayti; and as the yellow fever thins the ranks of white foreigners almost every year, (1858, '59 and '60 excepted,) such clerks advance easily into partnership, and finally become powerful men (in their own opinion.) So, by far the greatest number of the established merchants are what would be called in Europe, uncultivated *parvenus*, and consequently, can have no taste for refined customs and life.

A good number of them are married to, or live with mulatto women, so that their family life is a singular mixture of a pretentious outside, with a semi-African interior of manners. Few are disposed to return to Europe in order to finish their lives more agreeably. For, if married with Haytian women, family reasons induce them to remain; besides, the use (or rather the abuse) of alcoholic drinks (rum and gin) often shortens their lives in a singular way, and renders them early victims of a sure moral degradation.

Their intercourse with Haytians is characterized by hypocrisy. Every one vaunts himself as having no prejudice against the natives; but let several of them be together, and ridicule and mockery of Haytians will form a principal part of their entertainment. The sudden change of conversation on such occasions consequent on the appearance of a respectable Haytian, has often caused a singular effect upon the writer's mind. It is not his purpose here to write an apology for the Haytians; but all will see that, since the latter know the truth perfectly well, and are obliged to judge of whites generally by the few they know, a favorable judgment cannot result. This, indeed, is one great reason why they mistrust whites in general. When they have seen these clerks arrive in the country, accompanied with their whole fortune—a bag of clothes—lifting their hats obsequiously to every negro; and then growing every year more hypocritical, until the fates give them op-

portunity to sign their names below account-sales; and when they know the real feelings of these *parvenus*—is it astonishing that Haytians show their distrust even in their laws?

The morning, from eight to nine o'clock, is usually passed by these merchants in coffee-houses on the quay, (wharf,) where the news of the day are discussed, and several *gros* taken. Then they go to business until noon; breakfast and 'sieste' occupy till two o'clock; then the counting-room is again visited, and an hour is passed on the quay, where much honor is paid to the rum-bottle. At five o'clock begins the time of recreation; and it consists of riding on horseback out of town to call on any acquaintance, or to visit any place where more *grog* can be obtained. After sunset, one returns home for supper. Supper over, the remainder of the evening is, indeed, tedious. There are no theatres, rarely a concert or public amusement of any kind. One visits a friend, or receives a friend; they talk, and—what is indispensable to keep up their spirits—make frequent demands on the bottle. Card-playing for money is a usual attendant.

Doubtless some of these merchants have access to the English and French Ambassadors, for these gentlemen *must* have some society; and in their presence no doubt conduct themselves in a worthy manner—as much so as their education will permit.

An established merchant always desires to be the 'consul' of some nation, and this is the *ne plus ultra* of his aspirations. His favorite dream is to have a flag-mast attached to his residence. When it happens that a consul dies, then a veritable consulate race takes place—every one employing all his means, all his recommendations, all possible stratagems to obtain the vacant office. Should certain letters, which have been written for this purpose, be published, more than one of these merchant-consuls would blush with shame and confusion. But little matters it to them: to wear a European gold-striped uniform or epaulettes among negroes is altogether satisfactory to a *parvenu* merchant, who before never managed anything but cotton goods and bricks!

The writer once saw several consuls, on a gala occasion, (the 31st December,) going on horseback to visit Soulouque. The smaller the nation represented, the more brilliant was the uniform of the consul. Poor Soulouque was much perplexed in determining which were the great Powers. The United States consul had no uniform; he appeared in the garb of a citizen only—black, with a white waistcoat, without epaulettes or gold lace. Jonathan was seen to smile at the tawdry display of his fellow officials.

It is a singular fact that the State of Rhode Island has no consul in Hayti, though beyond question this post must have been applied for by some merchant.

When whites meet in the evening, Haytians are rarely present, and this separation is pretty generally observed. But on other occasions whites and Haytians mingle freely and publicly, and no white would dare to assume a superiority.

There is perhaps no country where life to the white folks passes so monotonously as in Hayti; and the person who does not find comfort in his own house, must necessarily be very unhappy. And this is the reason so many whites die in early life. They abandon themselves to excesses, the consequences of which are ruinous to both body and mind. There exists no unity among them; the pride of position is strong; and jealousies between different nationalities are sadly prevalent.

The financial crisis of 1857 was greatly disastrous to the interests of foreigners. There were few houses which did not suffer enormous

losses, and several failed. Should all the foreign houses now wind up their concerns, it is to be feared that few merchants would retire with fortunes. This state of things prevents social amusements—for those who spent money freely before are compelled now to study economy.—Soirees are exceedingly rare; and this causes young foreigners to seek amusements often among the lower class of people.

Formerly persons of wealth gave 'barbacos'—brilliant country dancing fetes—to which sometimes two hundred persons were invited. These were really splendid; but those times have passed.

Every where in small towns, every man's conduct is known and commented upon; and the whites of Hayti are not backward in this amusement. Every movement of one's neighbor is subject to criticism; and, as is usually the case in such communities, no very strict adherence to truth is maintained.

Foreigners are generally welcome in Haytian families, and a Haytian father is always proud to marry his daughter to a white, even though the fortune of the latter is disproportionate.—These unions are rarely happy; for the wife, accustomed from childhood to a careless life, seldom becomes a lady of society, and the brilliant, graceful exterior of manners is rarely attained by the good-hearted Creole in a degree to be compared with a white lady. Nevertheless, she is attached to her white husband—is his house-physician, and almost his servant—and faithfully she fulfills these offices. She will minister all the Haytian comforts of life, and if the husband's ambition does not extend beyond the family circle, he will be happy. The wife does not aspire to be brilliant among whites, but she will be proud of being the wife of a white man; and however kind to her less fortunate friends, will show a gentle superiority. She is especially fond of her children; and when a child departs for Europe to obtain an education, it is touching to witness the suffering of the distracted mother; and as her husband usually accompanies the child, she is left sad and disconsolate.

A white man is never well served, either by servant, cook, or any other *factotum*, unless he has a Haytian wife. He is regarded as a superior being in money matters, and must pay dearly for everything. A servant is never faithful unless overseen by a Haytian lady; and indeed she will herself complete the work.

There are few white ladies in Port-au-Prince; and if their husbands are well served, it is by the hands of their own ladies; for if a white lady attempts to manage Creole servants, the house will be always in revolt. A family may be maintained at much less expense with a Creole wife, than with a white one.

AD. ACKERMANN.

HOUSTON ON THE TROUBLES IN TEXAS.—A correspondent of the Galveston *News*, writing from Independence, Oct. 21, gives the following extract from a recent speech delivered by Gov. Sam Houston:—"In regard to the recent raid and incendiarism in Texas, he said it had been exaggerated and misrepresented by the letters of 'that man Pryor of Dallas,' the brother, he said, of Roger A. Pryor of Virginia, who had some time since sent a certain challenge. The fact was, that there had been but one white man hung in Texas for incendiarism—Herndon of Henderson, and two negroes; and there never had been a vial or bottle of poison found in the possession of any other negroes in this State—thus intimating very clearly that the others who were punished were unjustly punished.—However much he might regret the election of Lincoln, still, if constitutionally elected, he ought to and should be inaugurated. 'Yes! they would have to walk over his dead body if he was not.'"

SPEECH OF REV. DR. CHEEVER AT GLASGOW.

[From the Glasgow Daily Mail, Oct. 18, 1860.]

Last night, a public meeting was held in the City Hall to hear an address from the Rev. Dr. Cheever, of New York, on the question of Slavery, and his own struggles with the slave power in America. The hall was about two-thirds filled with ladies and gentlemen.—W. P. PATON, Esq., occupied the Chair.—After prayer by the Rev. Mr. Macgregor,

The CHAIRMAN said he did not need to bespeak for the subject to be brought before them a patient hearing. It was sad to think that in this nineteenth century of the Christian era it should still be a matter of controversy whether or not the blessed God of love and of mercy sanctioned human slavery. But such, unhappily, was the case. It was sad that many men whom we call good men, Christian men, on the other side of the Atlantic held that fearful doctrine that the blessed God who sent his Son into the world, not only to redeem men from the punishment of sin, but from all iniquity, that that gracious and good Being should sanction for a moment such an evil as holding human beings as chattels. Dr. Cheever had now established a world-wide reputation as an upright and unflinching advocate of the slaves, and as a man anxious to justify the ways of God to man. (Applause.) The chairman concluded by observing that as resolutions were to be moved by some of the gentlemen on the platform, in reference to the object for which they had met, it was unnecessary that he should detain them with more remarks.

The Rev. Mr. ARNOT, in moving the first resolution, said that he had sometimes observed that when a man was put forward at their meetings to say something before the speaker of the evening addressed them, there was a tendency to put him down. But they were not going to put him (Mr. A.) down, for he would not give them time to do so. (Laughter.) It was necessary that some citizen should lead the way in giving a welcome to Dr. Cheever. To avow clearly out-and-out anti-slavery sentiments on this side of the Atlantic, it did not require very much courage. Where all were on one side of the question it was easy to express our opinions. The twenty millions that were paid a good many years ago, perhaps, constituted a good argument for bringing us to one side on this subject. It was of the greatest consequence, and it was a truism which he scarcely needed to express, that we should maintain the most friendly and close intercourse with our brethren in America. (Applause.) Everything that operated in the one country was felt in its effects in the other. Two things in America which Dr. Cheever heartily hated, he (Mr. A.) also hated—the 'distillery' and the 'peculiar institution'—and he had learned from Dr. Cheever to hate the distillery and the peculiar institution more heartily than he would have done without him. There were two things which Dr. Cheever loved—the Alps and the 'Pilgrim's Progress'—and he (Mr. A.) had learned from Dr. Cheever to venerate and love the towering Alps and the Pilgrim's Progress even more than he had done before. (Applause.) He concluded by moving a resolution to the effect that the meeting gave Dr. Cheever a hearty and cordial welcome to this side of the Atlantic, and request him to give the audience information of what was important to know regarding slavery, and his personal struggles in America with the slave power.

The Rev. HENRY BATCHELOR seconded the motion. He had come there that night at great personal inconvenience to show his earnestness in the object for which they had met, by seconding the resolution, as he had to preach in the forenoon and make a speech in the evening of the following day at Dundee. At the demonstration in the City Hall some time ago he had spoken strongly in Dr. Cheever's behalf, and since then he had studied the subject more carefully in all its bearings, and he was now ready to affirm with redoubled emphasis all that he then uttered. He referred to the adverse manner in which the

New York *Independent* had spoken of his remarks on the occasion referred to, and said that that journal had utterly misstated his sentiments, and dared not publish his speech, which would have proved that what had been written against him was erroneous. He was glad that Dr. Cheever had begun his campaign in this empire so well, and referred to an enthusiastic meeting where he had first spoken, which was held in Leeds—a town that had stood foremost in anti-slavery matters for many years. He made some pointed remarks in reference to the unkindly treatment which Dr. Cheever had received in New York for his consistent opposition to slavery, and sat down amidst great applause.

Dr. CHEEVER then rose, and was received with loud cheering. He said—I stand here to-night to appeal in behalf of the freedom of God's Word against the sin of American slavery. I appeal in behalf of four millions of slaves and their posterity for your prayers, your sympathies, your remonstrances, without ceasing, against the infinite and complicated iniquity of such bondage. I appeal in behalf of equity and justice outraged on so terrible a scale—in behalf of the interests of humanity everywhere at stake—in behalf of Africa and its millions—in behalf of outraged piety, for the honor of the Cross—in behalf of universal Christendom, insulted by the sanction of this appalling sin—in behalf of nearly the whole world, revolting against the despotism of a system of such indescribable cruelty and wickedness. (Cheers.) I had hoped to be able to present this appeal without entering into the details of any of the conflicts thro' which in America every church which takes up the cause of the slave, and demands his freedom, will have to contest, at extreme cost, even its right of existence as an abolition church, fighting the slave power with the Word of God. But I find myself compelled into some notice of the extraordinary calumnies by which we have been assailed, and of the measures resorted to for the purpose of setting even the churches of Great Britain against us. (Hear, hear.) You are aware of the rapidity of the march of the slave power, the omnipotence it now wields, the impudence with which its maxims are assumed as the morality, and its dictates as the will of heaven. You are aware of the barriers of freedom it has swept away, the churches it has conquered, the citadels, theological, political, juridical, it has occupied, the constitutional supreme authority it has usurped, enthroned now on the highest tribunal of justice in the nation. You are aware of the infamous cruelties it has exalted into precedents, and established as its common law—of the increasing iniquity and inhumanity of its jurisprudence, the fugitive slave law, the Dred Scott decision, the maxim that black men have no rights that white men are bound to respect, the procedures of slave States selling the whole free colored population at auction into perpetual chattelism, and forbidding the emancipation of slaves, the free States at the same time conspiring to fasten those cruelties by exiling the negro race from their soil. You are aware of the increasing sanction and defence of the sin as an article of innocence and expediency, if not positive holiness, by churches, synods, ecclesiastical organizations of nearly every denomination, and missionary societies; the union of nearly all parties in abhorrence of the negro race, demanding its expulsion; the increase of the prejudice against color and power of cast thereon founded; the remorseless perfection with which the sin of slavery is eliminated of every element of mercy, and in such bare and unmitigated depravity is set up in the very temple of God as a Dagon for men's worship.

Your invitation has suggested to me first, the consideration of the present aspects of slavery, and progress of the slave power; and second, my own position and that of my fellow laborers, and some of our difficulties in maintaining it. (Cheers.) Within half-a-dozen years the progress of the slave power, and the demoniac justification of slavery, even by the Church of Christ, so called as a vested

right and sacred institution, have been appalling. Something, also, has been gained on the side of abolitionism, but nothing in comparison with the progress of the sin. (Applause.)

The rapidity of that progress has been mainly a result of the infamous Dred Scott decision carried everywhere into practice. Did time permit, I would reveal to you something of the horrors of the revival and renewal of the African and foreign slave trade—something also of the continuance and activity of the internal and domestic slave trade, defended as a vested right by the very men even who with ostentatious energy denounce the foreign slave trade as worthy of the gallows—something also of the horrors and atrocities of slave breeding for the markets, and the complicated and compound exasperations of kidnapping, and of the sale of white children by their fathers, and of the involutions of all these villainies for adoption and defence by northern merchants, statesmen, and theologians, on the plea that self defence, self interest, and the saving of the Union require that we should not break with the South on these points, nor irritate them by an interference, moral or political, with their vested rights, or any denial of the sacredness of their property in the bodies and souls of the immortal beings whom they buy and sell as chattels and as merchandise, making them over at any time to Northern merchants as security for Southern debts.

We cannot tamper with such a system as this; we cannot treat it with affectionate language; we cannot enter into any compromise with its advocates. They have sinned against the light, they hold the truth in unrighteousness, they seem given over of God to strong delusion, to believe a lie, because they loved not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. There ought to be no shield thrown between their consciences and the extremest burning condemnation of the Word of God. Yet there are those who scruple not to resort to the most unworthy sophistry to protect them, and to justify the churches for admitting them, with this very sin, to continued Christian fellowship. Paul did not speak against slaveholders by name, say they, but only against man-stealers, and the Greek word used to signify man-stealers is not the word he would have employed if slaveholders had been included in the condemnation! Now we say it is the word, with the Hebrew meaning. But this is the critical and trembling bridge thrown across this unfathomable gulf, over which an iniquity, adjudged of God to the penalty of death, under the law, shall be carried safely to the sanction of the Gospel. The offer of Blondin to trundle the Prince of Wales on a tight rope across the Falls of Niagara in his wheelbarrow was modesty in itself compared with the impudence of such presumption; and the folly of the fool that put himself on the rope walker's shoulders to be carried across the same gulf was wisdom in comparison with the madness that will throw the morals of the Church and the honor of the Word of God on the back of a theological and philological rope dancer.

It is a spectacle of profoundest wonder—these immoral Blondins of theology, who can run upon the stilts of a Greek criticism, where ordinary Christians and scholars can find no footing for the steadiest understanding. But they have prepared themselves by a long discipline of sophistry and technicality for such displays. They would not be afraid to take Mahommed's bridge to Paradise, confident of a solid and safe tread on the edge of the sharpest scimitar ever tempered. (Hear, hear.) We must call things by their right names, and it being indisputable that God's Word makes slaveholding as inconsistent with Christianity as murder, it must not be permitted to evade that condemnation by putting on a false dress. It would be like acquitting a criminal because he has adopted an alias. (Laughter.) The John Roe of your indictment calls himself Richard Roe, and so you justify him. (Hear, hear.) The condemnation of slaveholding as man-stealing is essential, or the Word of God is inapplicable to the crime. I am reminded of an Arctic traveler's descrip-

tion of the cunning of the foxes, when they found out the manner in which the hunters set their gun-traps, with the trigger fastened by a line to the bait, so that the moment the foxes attempted to take the bait, the gun went off and the thief was shot in the very act of robbery. When they found this out they would dig a trench in the snow underneath the line and bait, and then, advancing to the bait below the range of the shot, would draw it down and run off with it, while the shot whizzed over their heads perfectly harmless. (Cheers.) Just thus the opponents of abolitionism are teaching the slaveholder how to evade the charge of guilt with which the Word of God is loaded and aimed against him. By refusing to brand slaveholding as sin, you enable the robber to steal away his prey, unscathed by the shot. He takes your bait, but avoids your bullet, and you cannot touch him. It is not possible to level him, but with the grape shot of God's Word fired at him as a slaveholder, and at his slaveholding as always sin. (Applause.) You can do nothing but with the utmost plainness, applying the very denunciations of the Word of God. If the church and the ministry in the United States would unitedly do this, slavery would not stand; the slaveholder could not commit this crime and walk about as a respectable man and a Christian; the system of slavery and the act of slaveholding would come to an end. But so terrible and universal is the plague and fallacy of this wickedness—so fearfully has the infection struck even in our piety, that not only has the revival of religion failed to exert any perceptible influence against it; but if any one church and minister take openly and avowedly the ground of abolitionism, and call upon other churches and ministers to take the same ground with and upon the Word of God against slaveholding as inconsistent with Christianity, and to demand in God's name the immediate deliverance of those who are now enslaved, forthwith there is a union of the churches and the ministry to put a stop to the career of that church—to spike their guns—to silence what is denounced as their violence, vituperation, and fanaticism, and to deliver them over as infidels to Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme. (Laughter and loud cheers.) If obloquy and abuse—as Burke has grandly said—are essential parts of triumph, our triumph is complete. (Hear, hear.)

Now, the secret of the conflict as it rages against my particular church more than anywhere else, is simply and solely the avowed determination on our part, trusting to God to keep up this battle for the immediate and entire abolition of slavery. It is because we avow ourselves abolitionists, and are determined to be nothing at all in this great cause, if not that, and that too by the direct command of the Almighty, to break every yoke, and let the enslaved go free. (Cheers.) God never commanded us to set ourselves against the extension of slavery, and at the same time to let it remain where it is as a vested right. He commands us to abolish it. He speaks for the sake of the enslaved, and not for that abomination of hypocrisy and selfishness, the white man's party. (Hear, hear.) God speaks for the right and the relief of the victims of this cruelty—the four millions and their helpless babes now crushed down into merchandise by its avarice and lusts—that they be delivered just where they are, and raised up and treated as human beings.—Our anti-slavery is anti-slavery and abolitionism at God's command, just where slavery is, and not where it is not. And it is because of this that we are cast out as fanatics and madmen, because we direct the fire of God's Word against the present slaveholder in America as the man stealer, and demand the release of the very slaves whom now, at this moment, with the sanction of the church, and the pretended authority of God, he holds as his chattels. (Cheers.) It is because we insist upon this as a present duty, and preach against slaveholding as a present sin. It is because we do not let off a mere straggling expression now and then on a fast day—a transitory

flash as of lightning at midnight—but endeavor to keep up a continuous, steady stream of fire and light upon and against this great wickedness. (Great cheering.) And we are denounced because we demand the excommunication of the slaveholders from fellowship as Christians while they hold this sin; because we implore the American Board to cast out the slaveholder from their missionary churches; because we endeavor to arouse and unite all Christendom on this sure and righteous principle against this sin. The *N. Y. Independent* denounces us as abolitionists, and asks, Is Dr. Tyng an abolitionist? Is Dr. Gordon an abolitionist? Is Judge Jessup an abolitionist? Have any of the rulers of the Pharisees believed on him? But this fanatic people, who knoweth not the law, are accursed. The same journal pronounces judgment against me as the advocate of the now almost universally repudiated principle of Christian excommunication against this sin of slaveholding, and yet when it becomes necessary to make Christian men in this country believe that they and the churches are as thorough as my church or myself on this point, do not hesitate to claim that as their principle. They denounce it, and are for holding and proclaiming it at home, but proclaim it themselves abroad.

I introduced a resolution at the meeting of the American Board, declaring slaveholding an immorality, to be treated as such by the churches, and the resolution was opposed by Dr. Bacon of the *Independent*, and was rejected. I introduced a similar resolution in the Congregational body of ministers, declaring slaveholding an immorality to be preached against, and it was opposed there also, but passed at length, rejecting, however, the word 'slaveholding' at the instance of Dr. Thompson, thus depriving the resolution of its grasp upon the conscience of the slaveholder, and enabling him to evade both the law and the gospel, being admitted as a slaveholder into the Christian church, and into the missionary churches. The resolution would not have been introduced at all, in any shape, but for me, and at my urgency; for the war against slavery was being carried on, not in the very unpopular way of charging slavery as sin, but in the popular way of denouncing the Tract Society for not being willing to denounce its abuses in their publications, and all Dr. Thompson's efforts and resolutions were only in condemnation of the Tract Society. My resolution went against slaveholding as in itself sinful, and this the editors of the *Independent*, and the great body of the churches and the ministry, reject as ultraism and fanaticism; and yet, in this country, and for the purpose of making it believed here, that my view and the views of my church are not in any degree in advance of theirs, the editors of the *Independent* now claim as theirs the very principle which they have denounced me for advocating; and Dr. Thompson goes so far as to claim the very resolution on this subject, prepared and introduced by me, as his own resolution, because of that alteration which was proposed and carried by him, and which, in the use made of it, takes away nearly all its efficacy. (Hear, hear.)

To get credit in this country for the churches I myself am presented as simply the representative of the purest and best anti-slavery of the churches, and yet, to prevent the success of my efforts here, I am denounced and my church misrepresented as violent, fanatical, extreme, imprudent, disorganizing. This double representation must be a mystery to you, for I myself stand perplexed and in doubt before it. (Cheers.) 'The voice is Jacob's, and the hands are Esau's.' Nay, there are two voices, and the one denies the other.—The voice at home says aside to the churches, 'Gentlemen, Dr. Cheever and his church misrepresent and vituperate us, and are endeavoring to get money on false pretenses, as if they were persecuted for righteousness' sake, and as if they were truer in their anti-slavery principle, and more faithful to them than others. They are fanatical and violent abolitionists, whom we disown, and warn all the

country against supporting them or following their example. They are making the pulpit and the Word of God a mere vehicle of cursing and of bad temper—an Ebal without any answering Gerizim—and are doing infinite mischief to the cause of which they pretend to be the warmest advocates. We, on the other hand, are full of love and peace, and manage to carry on the war against slavery without strife, without any offence given or taken in the fullness of the blessings of millennial glory, the lion and the lamb lying down together in the same fold. They would expel every slaveholder from the churches as a man stealer; we abhor such wholesale bitterness and calling of hard names, and we abjure the abolitionism of which they are the prophets and supporters. We maintain our anti-slavery principles without any opposition or unpopularity in our churches; the people know our principles, and that is enough; we do not need to be always proclaiming them, and as to the slavery at the South, we have no responsibility—no right to interfere. Dr. Cheever and his church, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society, are all in the same condemnation of abolitionism, and we denounce them as unworthy of our confidence, and very dangerous to follow in their ruinous career.'

The other voice, the voice abroad, speaketh in this wise, it being as envious a creature as ever was imagined in Prospero's Island. (A laugh.) His backward voice is to utter bad speeches and to detract; his forward voice now is to speak well of his friend—'Gentlemen, Dr. Cheever is worthy of all honor and praise, and you may be sure he will always be faithful to the cause of the enslaved. We send him to you as a simple representative of the best anti-slavery sentiment of the churches of New England. There is nothing new in his views, nor is he the only man among us who is faithful to them. But he is worthy of your confidence; take him to your hearts, and give him a grand reception. Let his church go—but take care of the pastor—avoid all sympathy with them, but shower your compliments on him, for we admire his faithfulness, and maintain his views.'

Now, upon my word, I don't know what to make of this. I cannot understand it. If you can, you are welcome to any elucidation of the mystery; but I pray you bear me witness that most unwillingly do I refer to this matter, or waste one word upon it, being compelled to do so by the industrious circulation of injurious and ambiguous voices in this country, intended to produce a sentiment of distrust towards me and my church, and effectually to prevent the success of any appeal which I might have desired to make for sympathy and aid. The most absurd and inconsistent slanders have been printed and scattered abroad against us. If we engaged ourselves in throwing back the mud and stones which are showered upon us, or even in carting them out of the way, forty scavengers would have to be employed nearly all their time, and we could do nothing but oversee them. (Cheers.) But, after all, they are blundering antagonists. They have advertised their opposition in a protest signed by some thirty persons, and printed in Great Britain, against the action of the church in support of its pastor, and against my own efforts to obtain encouragement in this dreadful conflict in behalf of the enslaved. (Cheers.) The appeal of the church, if successful, mortifies and defeats them, and they are absolutely fanatical in their bitterness against it. I am reminded of an anecdote of the Pasha of Egypt having to drill the Egyptian army in European tactics. The new Christian system, as it was called, was unpopular among the Turks, even to fanaticism, and on one occasion, while putting the men through the exercise of platoon firing, the Pasha heard the whistling of several bullets about his own ears. He coolly stopped, and gave the order to cease the exercise, and then sharply reproved the men for being such contemptibly bad shots; not one of them had hit him. But begin again, said he, you can do better another time. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, it is impossible for me,

across the Atlantic, to bid these fanatical riflemen to stop shooting, but I can at least assure them that I could teach them a better aim. 'Your practice is sharp, gentlemen, but you are disgracefully bad shots.'

The protest to which I have referred embraces the following points:—1st, The appeal was first made by a few individuals, without the knowledge of the church or society. Answer—They had a perfect right to make it, for they did not make it in the name of the church, or as an appeal by the church, and the society was not even referred to, and had no authority or responsibility in the matter. The protest is made by a few individuals against the deliberate action of the church as a church; and if they have the right to make such a protest, much more had a few individuals, acting for the benefit of the church, this right to make an appeal for aid. Ours is a Congregational church, you say, and a fundamental principle of our organization is that all questions of general interest connected with the church shall be acted on by the whole body. Then the protest ought to have been so acted on, and had it been submitted to the knowledge and decision of the church, would have been forbidden. The action of the self-constituted minority inaugurating this protest, is a usurpation of the rights of the church, and subversive of our principles as a congregational body.

2d, The protestors against the appeal charge upon us an intention to change the character of our organization. Answer—There is no such intention: there never was. When it is said that we wish for aid in order to establish our citadel of the gospel on the foundation of a free church, it is merely the reducing of the expense of the sittings (by providing for the ground rent) to so moderate a rate, and the provision for such a number of free sittings, that the poor, as well as the rich, may have a place in the house of God, and not be ruled out of their privileges either by the money power or the slave power.

3d, The protestors say that they protest against the appeal because of the strifes and divisions which have resulted from it.—Answer—The protestors themselves have produced these strifes and divisions, endeavoring as a minority to overrule the majority, and by means of strife and division to compel the pastor to retire from the church. For that purpose they deliberately discussed the whole question, and settled it by sanctioning, adopting, and re-affirming the appeal, appointed the same 'self-constituted committee' to take charge of it, and ordered that it be sent forth anew to the churches of Great Britain, declaring its integrity and necessity. It was then the duty of these protestors to cease their opposition, or to retire from the church. The opposition of a minority to the deliberate will and action of the church, is faction and schismatic, and as such is disorderly, and directly and inevitably productive of strife.—But these protestors not only would not submit to the declared determination of the church to sustain the appeal and the pastor, but carried their factious opposition into the society; and then, at the annual meeting for the election of trustees, formed a party with the intention of appointing to that office persons opposed to the appeal and to the action of the church as an abolition church, and of the pastor as a preacher of abolition doctrines. The judges of the election, and scrutinizers, and tellers of the votes on this occasion were selected from their own party; but when the votes were declared, it was found that the candidates of the church, the persons in favor of abolition and of the appeal, and of sustaining the pastor in the war of God's Word against slaveholding as sin, were elected by the legal majority. These persons were accordingly declared elected, and were thenceforth the legal trustees. But the law requires the judges of the election to issue a certificate under their signature of the election, of the persons having the highest number of votes, and so declared at the election, and provides that such certificate shall be the legal

proof of such election, and of the right of the persons elected to possess their office. These judges, finding that the election had gone against the protestors, refused to issue the required certificates, although they had declared the persons elected, to whom they refuse them. Had they rested there, it would have been comparatively a small matter. But after consultation on the matter with the defeated parties, they deliberately proceeded to issue certificates of election to the defeated candidates, declaring them duly elected to the office of trustees.

This high-handed outrage compelled the persons who had been declared elected, but from whom the certificates had been unjustly withheld, to carry their cause, in behalf of the church and society, to the courts for redress. But this part of their complaint, detailing this wrong and fraud, and the history of it, are suppressed by the protestors in their protest, and only a portion is given to the British public. If the authors of this outrage had been the best anti-slavery persons in the world, the wrongfulness of this act would have been no less conspicuous. But they have avowed themselves as opposed to the kind and manner of anti-slavery agitation and efforts pursued by the pastor and the church, and against any appeal for sympathy and aid of British Christians to animate and support the pastor and the church, as an abolition church, in their conflict against the slave power. If they dislike the anti-slavery method and manner of the pastor, and prefer to carry out their professed anti-slavery principles in some other way, they ought to have withdrawn;—but they have no right as a minority to remain and oppose the pastor and the church in their chosen way in the conflict against slavery, which seems to them the right way. In so remaining and opposing, they are themselves producing strife and dissension, and laboring to defeat the pastor and the church, destroy their influence, cut off their means of support, and prevent the freedom of the Word of God against slavery. Some of them are the very persons who would have a negro pew.

4th, The protestors say that they oppose the appeal, because they are not paupers, but that, as a church and society, they are abundantly able to meet all their legitimate wants. Answer—The protestors are able. They are wealthy, and have withdrawn their ability and wealth from the support of the church and pastor as an abolition church, rendering it necessary for the church, on that very account, to appeal for aid. They have endeavored to remove the pastor, and have openly avowed this as their object. They have declared that by his preaching against slavery, and by the course into which he has drawn the church, he was making it a nuisance in the community, and was greatly diminishing the value of the church property. They have declared that the prosperity of the church, and the fulfilment of its mission required the removal of the pastor. To this end they endeavor to prevent the possibility of his getting a support for his church in the abolition conflict. Some of the protestors belonged neither to the church nor the society. Some of them have thrown up their pews, in order not to contribute to the support of the church; but, at the same time, in order to maintain the right of a vote in the society, and thus the opportunity of opposing and annoying the abolition and appeal party, have taken single sittings in the outskirts of the church or in the galleries by the payment of a few shillings. Some among them I had supposed were my friends and friends of the enslaved, but they have now been persuaded into a measure which places them and their influence directly against us, and weakens our ability and power. If these protestors would support the church and its pastor, instead of combining to defeat us, we should need no other aid.

5th, The protestors accuse us of an attempted despotism by the money power, because we are endeavoring to sustain ourselves in opposition to their effort to put us down

No answer is required to this absurdity. 6th, The protestors say that this appeal is made a test of anti-slavery. Answer—Unless we get aid, we cannot continue to fight against slavery in the Church of the Puritans with the Word of God. Those who oppose this aid do therefore oppose our anti-slavery efforts and strength.

7th, The protestors say that the appeal is injurious to the anti-slavery cause. Answer—The church declare that it is quite essential to the support of that cause, through our instrumentality. The dissension growing out of it is entirely the work of the protestors, and would cease if they ceased opposing us.

8th, The protestors say that they are opposed to the appeal because it is not right to settle by the arbitration of money a question which the parties interested have not mutually submitted to such arbitration. Answer—It is this very arbitration by the money power which the church and pastor are resisting. The protestors, by possessing the money power, and withholding the revenue of the church, are endeavoring to compel the church to submit to their will, and desert their pastor. They are attempting to arbitrate by starvation, and the church and pastor are seeking reinforcements to disappoint that plan. The endeavor of the church and pastor to sustain themselves with the aid of friends, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the aid of the protestors, and against the conspiracy to overthrow the pastor, they affirm to be the arbitration of the question by the money power. They say, renounce your abolitionism and the appeal by which you would sustain it, or you shall be starved out. Our independence, in spite of their opposition, by the aid of those who sympathize with us in behalf of the enslaved, they affirm to be the settlement of a question by a money arbitration, and an interference with the internal affairs of a Christian church. But it is the protection of the church against such a despotism. Some of the protestors, joining with certain trustees, undertook so to alter the title deeds of the pews, as to deprive the church of its revenue. By such efforts and influences, the church being crippled and impoverished, the protestors now denounce the effort of the church for its own maintenance as the arbitration of a question by the interference of money. It is, in truth, the arbitration of the question of our being compelled by starvation into a surrender to the slave power. There is a mutiny, and those who hold the garrison against the mutineers send off to friends for aid. The mutineers protest against the garrison receiving such aid, saying that it is unfair to them and subversive of their rights to have the dispute between them settled in such a way. The whole country of America is in rebellion against God and His truth, against duty and freedom, maintaining the vested rights of slavery, and supporting the despotism of the slave power. Beleaguered by that power in our citadel in Union Square, we are commanded to surrender, and because we send over for help to the Christians in Great Britain, the enemies of freedom assail us even here, and would prevent you from bestowing that aid and sympathy which would enable us, by the blessing of God, to maintain our post, and fight on with God's Word and God's Spirit against slavery. Now, may God forgive our opponents and turn their energies against our common foe, this gigantic, corporate, and individual sin! I am not willing to call them enemies, for some of them are personal friends; but they are mistaken, and under a cloud of prejudice and partisan zeal. May God preserve us from a bad spirit, and give them a better!

Most deeply am I sensible that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. In this conflict we need to be baptised more than in any other with the spirit of love. We need that love towards the oppressor as well as the oppressed. But when we come to the Word of God, and inquire our duty there, we find that we are bound to defend the oppressed against the oppressor, and to do it in the way and with the weapons that God ap-

points. We find that Jefferson, himself a slaveholder, uttered an awful truth when he said that the Almighty has not one attribute that can take part in behalf of the oppressor in this conflict. We find that the love of God and the oppressor binds us to report to the slaveholder, from the Word of God, the name and the nature of his guilt, as God describes it, and the precise reprobation with which God has branded it, forbidding it on pain of death. It is a cardinal principle of the morality of love in such a case, that thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor; thou shalt not suffer sin upon him. We find that the heaviest maledictions in the Word of God are against this iniquity—that all its features are made the subject of special and awful maledictions in turn; and not only so, but the fountain crime, the act and sin of slaveholding, whence flow all the consequent particular violations of every commandment in the Decalogue, is set apart by itself—apart from its consequences, as a sin in itself, in the same category with the crime of murder. We ask, for what possible purposes are these maledictions crowded and concentrated in God's Word, but to be applied against that very sin, to be used in God's name in the great work of its abolition. They are to be used in reliance on God, under the influence of his Spirit, in the exercise of love, and not of wrath. But they must be used, and who can use them but the church of God and the ministry of Jesus Christ, to whom his Word is command, with command and authority to apply it against all sin, whether men will hear or forbear. There is nothing else that will reach men's consciences, nothing that will subdue them, but this will, for God has declared it. His own omnipotence is committed to His church, if they will throw themselves on Him, and just as His early disciples did, speak His Word in the face of opposing nations. This is the only salvation, God's wrath revealed from Heaven against all unrighteousness, and Jesus as the Savior of sinners, not in their sins, but from them. Now, if the Church of God, if the ministers of Jesus had taken His Word and applied it against this sin many years ago, it would have been abolished. If the church, in the spirit of love and power, and of a sound mind, had applied the pungent and terrible fire of the Word against those who practice this sin, there would have been no need of any other warfare against it. (Cheers.) There would have been no need of John Brown, and no such awful tragedy as the judicial murder of that majestic Christian hero—(applause)—if the ministry had armed themselves with God's Word, and made that moral incessant resistance against the sin and its supporters which they were bound to do.

But the longer this faithfulness is deferred, the more necessary it becomes, and the greater is the burden of those who come after, and whose souls God may set on fire, and the greater are the perils and disadvantages under which they work, and the greater is the agitation and enmity and wrath which the Word produces, and the greater the demand for the extremest intensity and incessantness in the play of its thunderings and lightnings. And this is just the spectacle, the fierce moral conflict, God's Word and Satan grappling, that we desire to see; this is just the trial and the development of Christianity which we are longing, yearning to behold. This is the vindication of the Cross from the charge of being the minister of sin and such sin, which the church and the ministry are bound in faithfulness to their Master, though its cost be even unto death, to fling forth to a gazing world; this conquest of the most gigantic sin that ever bound the world and infected and corrupted the church in its pestilential involutions. (Cheers.)

Let but a few churches unite, filled with the spirit of the old Hebrew prophets, and of Him whose Spirit spake by the Prophets as well as the Apostles—apply the fire of the Divine Word with prayer for the Divine Spirit, in fearless reliance on God, right to the heart and the seat of this iniquity, there where it reigns, and it would be speedily seen that

what all political power, management, compromise, all carnal wisdom, all selfish bargains, all motives and compulsions even of interest could not do, God's Word can do. This would be the greatest triumph of Christianity in modern times, and would be felt in the farthest corners of heathenism. It would do more for the conversion of the world than all the missionary efforts from the Reformation to this day. (Cheers.) It is such an application that in all our weakness, and with every power against us, the despised and hated Church of the Puritans and its pastor are humbly and earnestly endeavoring to make.

This is our experiment, and we beseech you to aid us in it, and we assure you of the vast power exerted by your sympathy and uncompromising utterances on the right side. The moral electricity of a meeting here travels across the Atlantic, and the rage and violence resulting from your rebuke are a proof of its effectiveness. If your churches will array themselves against this iniquity, even the boundless cotton interest cannot any longer shield it. The slave power, when it sees you doing this, will come to you with sackcloth on its loins, and ropes on its head, with affecting appeals for pity. 'Thy servant, Ben-hadad; I pray thee, let me live.' It watches now diligently whatever word may come from you, and hastily catches it; and if you should at any time say to the monster, my brother, and send him away with the covenant of cotton, you would be worse than Ahab of old, when he let go out of his hand an enemy of Israel, whom God had appointed to utter destruction. (Loud cheering.)

At a meeting held last week in the Church of the Puritans, resolutions were introduced and passed sustaining the course taken by their pastor, and again sanctioning the appeal.

THE JERRY RESCUE CELEBRATION.

ANNUAL ADDRESS BY REV. SAMUEL J. MAY.

Syracuse, October 1, 1860.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—In the lamented absence of that illustrious philanthropist who has usually presided on this occasion, the Committee of arrangements devolved it upon me to prepare and deliver the opening address.—Its distinctive object shall be, as it ever has been, to republish and recommend the sacred principles, on which those men acted, who did the humane, the glorious deed, which we this day celebrate.

The Rescue of Jerry was not done in opposition to government, but in obedience to the highest authority, in resistance to tyranny, which is every where and always antagonistic to government. It was not done in defiance of law, but in reprobation of an attempted outrage upon law.

In justifying and applauding the Rescue of Jerry, we do not assume independence of the State or of the Confederacy to which our State belongs, but only declare that neither the State nor the confederacy is independent of God—-independent of the obligation that is upon all men, 'to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly;' and that neither the State nor the Confederacy can release us individually from our allegiance to the Law of the Most High.

In celebrating now, as we have done from year to year, the Rescue of Jerry, we do not mean, we have never meant, to countenance our fellow citizens in disturbing the peace, violating the good order of society, but to manifest the respect that is due to those who, on the 1st of October, 1851, generously, at great hazard to themselves, snatched a poor fellow being from the grasp of a mean and cruel despotism. We have never by this celebration intended, we do not now intend, to insult the Chief Magistrate or the Legislature of these United States, but to admonish them that even they cannot, with impunity, set God at defiance, and may not, shall not, compel us to insult Him.

God is Ruler of Rulers, Governor of Governors, King of Kings. The mightiest nation, not less than the lowliest individual, is bound

to obey Him. The lowliest individual is to be justified in setting at naught the enactment of the mightiest nation, if it violates the eternal principles of righteousness and mercy.

The first, the greatest of all commandments is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.' And the second is like unto it, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' On these two commandments hang, from them depend—that is, with them must be consistent all laws that impose any obligation upon men; all laws that can be innocently obeyed.—Only such laws as may be deduced from both or one of these commandments, have any divine authority.

It used to be claimed and allowed throughout Christendom, as well as heathendom, that Kings reigned by a divine right, and that subjects were bound, in all things, to obey them as the vicegerents of the Almighty. But that assumption has subsided in every part of the Christian world; and in our country it is utterly repudiated. It was laid down by the founders of our Republic as a fundamental principle, that all the powers of a just civil government are derived from, must have been delegated by the governed. Now, the governed cannot commit to their officials any right, any authority, which they do not themselves possess. They possess no right, they have no permission, to disobey any of the commandments of God. Therefore the government cannot derive from them any authority to require any unrighteous act of them.

This proposition, Fellow Citizens, will commend itself to you all the more as incontrovertibly true, when you consider the significant fact, that these two great commandments, of which we are speaking, were laid upon man as an individual, not as a constituent of the body politic, or as a party to any civil compact, but as an individual—a being sustaining such relations, on the one hand, to God who made him, and on the other hand, to his fellow beings, as do obviously give rise to the moral and religious obligations that depend from these two seminal, all comprehensive commandments.

In each case, we repeat, Jesus Christ spoke to men as individuals, and he inculcated these principles of moral conduct because they were right. The obligation to conform to them arose then, as it arises now, from the constitution of man which the all wise God devised, and of which Jesus Christ was the best expounder, a constitution not written upon parchment, but upon the living tables of the human heart—a constitution, of course, much more ancient, venerable, sacred, than any which men have framed for national purposes. We are not, therefore, to wait until the civil government under which we live, shall see fit to conform itself to these requirements of the Just and Holy, before we give our individual obedience to them. Individuals generally must precede nations in their conformity to God's will. This they must often do through persecution and suffering. Such is the high calling of those who are to be accounted as benefactors, the lights of the world, the leaders of reform. Every one, when he comes to know himself amid his relations to other beings, will see that the two greatest commandments of Christ are founded in eternal righteousness, and justly claim his prompt, entire obedience. If there be any man who does not discern the reasonableness of these commandments, and the obligation that rests upon himself to obey them—if these have not become self evident to him, matters of consciousness to his moral sense—it must be because his intellectual and moral nature is undeveloped. He needs education, culture; and the greatest concern of society is to see to it, that its constituents shall become so cultivated and enlightened, that at least they shall not be ignorant of the first principles of right and wrong.

Those rulers are not such as God approves, not such as we should respect, who aim merely to exact from their subjects a blind obedience to their authority, instead of encouraging

and assisting them to discern the things that are right, and to conform to them because they are right. Much less can we believe that those rulers were ordained of God, who prescribe to their subjects or fellow citizens what they know to be not right, and then go about to compel them to obey such enactments, however it may violate their consciences to do so, or outrage their feelings.—To compel any man to do wrong is to compel him to set his own moral nature at naught, which is to do himself the greatest harm. If the subject or the citizen consents to this he sins; he sets God at defiance; he chooses to serve Baal, or Moloch, or Mammon instead.

Unless there be an authority higher than that of the Most High, an authority capable of making wrong right, there can be, as Jesus said, no commandments greater than these, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Surely no commandments less than these, most certainly no enactments of men that contravene these fundamental laws of God, can have a just claim to our obedience.

Nevertheless it has been assumed by many, and since September, 1850, it has been stoutly maintained by some, from whom we should have expected better things, that a law of the land, although it be contrary to the two great commandments of Christ, although it requires of us most unrighteous and cruel acts toward our neighbors, ought to be obeyed, because it is a law, and because, if we do not obey it, the authority of our rulers will be stricken down, and our civil fabric fall to pieces. Now, it seems to us that all this is predicated upon a very false assumption as to the true nature and province of law, an erroneous view of the source of governmental powers, and of the extent of each individual's obligations to the State or Kingdom, in which he may happen to live.

Mistakes on these points are unpardonable in the prominent men of our country, because the truth on these points was seen so clearly and declared so emphatically by the founders of our political institutions. Those renowned men, who eighty four years ago, dared to renounce their allegiance to the British Crown, and to establish new governments for their several States, and for the Confederacy, did so in virtue of 'the self-evident truths that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' Men were not made that they may be the subjects of an oppressive political compact called a Republic, any more than they were made to be the creatures of a despot. Men were not made for governments, but governments were made for men.

In the light of the Declaration of Independence all may see, and with its most weighty sanction we may confidently affirm, that all attempts to make a law which would violate the unalienable rights of man, must be morally abortive, and all attempts to enforce such a statute may be denounced as oppressive, cruel. If an individual king should do this he would be branded as a tyrant, and the character of the act would not be any better, because done by a majority. It matters not how large the majority may be in its favor, if the enactment be designed and adapted to deprive one man of his unalienable rights, it cannot become a legitimate law. Men would be guilty before God who should assist to enforce it, nay, if they would not endeavor to prevent its being enforced. An unrighteous, cruel enactment can derive no lawfulness from the consent of the governed. Those whom it may be intended to favor had no right to give their consent to it. If they should, their consent would be morally invalid, because men have no more authority to alienate their own inalienable rights, than others have to take those rights away. A man could no more be justified in voluntarily surrendering his liberty at the command of a tyrant, or a tyrannical ma-

jority, than he would be justified in taking away his own life in obedience to a mandate from the same quarter. The rights to life, liberty and happiness are the most sacred gifts of our Creator. We may not wantonly trample them under our own feet, nor cast these most precious pearls before swine. No. They are trusts for which we are accountable, for in the proper exercise of them alone can we develop the nature with which we are endowed, and become what God made us to be.

We must, we do condemn utterly, we denounce as fearfully false the doctrine, that we ought sometimes, even now, to obey man rather than God, a cruel enactment of the government of our country rather than the eternal, righteous, merciful law of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe. This is a doctrine that would throw distrust over the moral government of the world, and lead men directly to *Atheism*. It is a doctrine that casts reproach upon the noble army of martyrs, both political and religious, whose blood has been the seed of the highest improvements in church and state. It would condemn the prophets of the Old Testament, the Apostles of the New, and Jesus Christ himself. All these set at naught the commandments of Princes, Governors, Kings, because they required that which was wrong, contrary to the will of God.

This doctrine, insisted on by so many of the prominent statesmen of our country, and maintained by so many of our religious teachers, 'divines,' doctors of divinity; this doctrine contradicts not only the Bible and our Declaration of Independence, but the fundamental principles of human legislation and civil government, as they are laid down by those who are the acknowledged masters of this subject.

Lord Coke declares that 'the common law doth control acts of Parliament, and *adjudge them void*, when they are against common right and reason.'

Sir William Blackstone laid down the same principles even more broadly, and recurs to it repeatedly. 'The law of nature,' he says, 'being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this, and such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.' * * * 'If any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit murder, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine laws.'

Again, this great legal authority says:—'Those rights which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as are life and liberty, need not the aid of human law to be more effectually invested in men than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable. On the contrary, no human legislature has power to abridge or destroy them, unless the man shall himself commit some act that amounts to a forfeiture.' Lord Bacon says, 'As the common law is more worthy than the statute law, so the law of nature is more worthy than them both.'

Lord Brougham also says:—'There is a law, *above all human enactments*, written by the finger of God on the heart of man.'

Chief Justice Parsons, of Massachusetts, one of the brightest lights of legal science in our country, used often to say, 'Gentlemen, what is right, what is right, for that is law, or we must make it so.'

The same great principle is also laid down distinctly, and often appealed to, in the writings of our own Chancellor Kent, than whom we have no higher authority on the theory, or the practical application of Law.

Indeed, it is a maxim with the writers on Law generally, 'that nothing can sanction or legalize injustice; that no law, subversive of natural right, has any binding obligation.'—Even the authors of the Code Napoleon have said, 'that no legislator can escape that in-

visible power, that silent judgment of the people, which tends to correct the mistakes of arbitrary legislation, and to defend the people from the law, and the lawgiver from himself.'

At a tribunal, where a true man is presiding, a conclusive argument proving that the law which had been violated was itself subversive of natural right, unjust, contrary to the moral constitution of man—I have not a doubt, that a conclusive argument to this effect would draw from the Judge a charge to the Jury, that they must find the accused not guilty of crime, because the law was one that ought not to be obeyed. What decision ever given, has been more applauded than that of the Vermont Judge, who, in the case of a man brought before him, and claimed as a slave, having heard all the testimony the claimant could adduce, said:—'Nothing can satisfy me that this man is the property of another man, *nothing less than a bill of sale from the Almighty*.'

But, say the abettors of the 'Fugitive Slave Bill,' the demands which this enactment makes on us, are in pursuance of the compromises of the Constitution. Then, we reply, it was a compromise which ought never to have been made. It could not have been binding even upon those who made it, unless men have power to abrogate the law of God. Much less could any obligation to conform to such a requirement have been transmitted to their posterity.

Here we may be told that a few years later in 1793, Congress enacted a law expressly designed to carry out that part of the Constitution said to have been intended to ensure the recovery of fugitives from slavery; and it is added, the provisions of that bill were almost as abhorrent to humanity as those of the bill of 1850. What does all this prove? Taken in connection with the history of the last fifty-seven years, it proves that such a law cannot, as it ought not to, be enforced. The enactment of 1793, all know, had become a dead letter.

Yes, the advocates of this Mason and Webster Bill rejoin, 'because the statute of 1793 had become inoperative, it was necessary to enact the Law of 1850 with more stringent provisions; and *this law must be obeyed, or else the Union will certainly be dissolved*.'—All we can say in reply to this is, that, if indeed the union of these States cannot be preserved but by our consenting to do the great unrighteousness which this 'Bill of abominations' requires, then it is plain that our union is at an end; on such a condition it ought not to be, it cannot be continued. 'Let justice be done though the heavens fall,' is an old maxim often quoted from the Latin, as embodying a great principle of morality.—Surely, then, we may say, without being transcendental in our uprightness—'Let this great injustice not be done, though the Union falls.'

Yet, again, though the upholders of this horrid Bill have the grace to allow that we may do all in our power to procure the repeal of what they call the *Law*, yet they insist that, until it is repealed, we are bound, and shall be compelled to obey it. 'Truly this is a queer way of getting an atrocious enactment repealed—to keep on obeying it. Their reasoning is this:—because an unjust law is enacted we must obey it as a law, and yet do all we can to repeal it because it is unjust and ought not to be a law. Seeing that iniquity is established by Statute, we must keep the statute until we can destroy it; uphold it until it can be overthrown! Such beetle logic may safely be left to confute itself. Because the majority have resolved to sin, we must go with them, and keep on sinning to the end of the chapter, and then turn right about and sin no more, because we have at length succeeded in convincing the majority, that we are all miserable sinners, especially we who know better, and so have added the guilt of hypocrisy to the guilt of cruelty.'

But, as this writer says, a still more conclusive answer may be drawn from history.—Experience-teaches us that obedience to an

unjust law never procured its repeal. The actual method, by which communities have gotten rid of unrighteous laws, has been by protesting against them, disobeying them, and thus coming into conflict with the government at the bar of public opinion, the common moral sense of mankind, which is the great umpire on earth, to whom majorities and monarchs must ultimately bow. First, the people have thrown unjust laws aside, and then the Legislature have abrogated them because they were thrown aside. First, the law has perished because of its injustice, and then been buried by statute because it was dead.

What would be the effect on those who used 'all their personal and official influence' to procure the enactment and enforce obedience to this Fugitive Slave Bill; what, I ask, would be the effect on them, if it should be known that we, the people of Central New York, who have from the first protested so loudly against it, were, nevertheless, every where consenting to obey it in all its provisions? Would they not point to the fact, as a signal evidence of the eminent success of their 'peace measures.' If the people of the North will only become 'the settlers,' 'the terriers,' 'the blood hounds,' of the Southern men hunters, they will not care how much we bark and howl about the decree that would make us such dogs. But when we turn upon them and drive them from the field, they are made to know that we will not be their creatures, and moreover, that they cannot pursue their game across our domains, which are consecrated to liberty and humanity.

Once more, it is urged by the abettors of this great iniquity, that we are very presumptuous in setting up our individual opinions, in opposition to the enlightened wisdom of the greatest statesmen of the country, the majority of our legislators and of their constituents. Now, this is not stating the case fairly. The Fugitive Slave Law is not an offence to only here and there a few individuals. Millions see and acknowledge it to be most flagrantly unjust and cruel. The minority in Congress opposed to its enactment was a very large one, and a large part of the majority, both in and out of Congress, execrate the law, at the same time that they insist upon obedience to it. Indeed, it would be hard to find a person, not steeped in the sin of slaveholding from his birth, who would undertake to show the justice, much less the mercifulness, of this outrageous edict.

The question, then, before the country, is, whether a law, which a vast majority allow to be a wicked one, which even the most unscrupulous adherents of Mr. Webster at first recoiled from with horror—a law which outrages all the natural, indefeasible rights of those against whom it is directed, and does violence to every good feeling of those who are called upon to execute it—the question is whether such a law ought to be obeyed, merely because by legislative management a majority of the members of Congress was obtained for it? If the will of the majority be absolute—if there be no appeal from it—if there be no natural, eternal principles of right and wrong, upon which we may fall back in such an emergency, we see not how our own liberties are more secure under our form of government, than they would be under a monarchy or even a despotism. The way in which the supporters of this law have flouted at conscience, and the moral sense of mankind, shows how little fitted they are to help forward our great experiment of self-government.

Men differ much on minor questions of morals, and there is room for honest differences. But the glorious principles announced in the Declaration of American Independence were *self-evident* to all men. And wherever, in our Northern States, the people should be brought to witness an attempt to *take from a man his liberty*, and reduce him to the condition of a domesticated brute, a thousand voices would cry, shame upon the deed, for every one, that would attempt to justify it. Tell us not, then, that we are setting up

our individual consciences against the conscience of the nation. A vast majority abhor this law, though, there may be a majority that, for certain political reasons, have concluded it is expedient to sustain the law, or pretend to sustain it, bad as it is. We have the heart of our nation with us, though the head may be against us.

The followers of the expedient rather than the right would fain make it appear that our opposition to this enactment tends to the subversion of law. We know better, and so do they. The only claim which an enactment of our State or National government can have to our respect and obedience, *is its justice*.—If it be unjust, only to our property, if it subject us only to pecuniary loss or to personal inconvenience, we may, for the sake of peace, we ought to submit to it. But when it requires us, as this Fugitive Slave Bill does, to inflict the greatest injury upon others, *we are not at liberty to obey*. We are bound by our obligations to God and man to set the law at naught—to prevent its execution. 'Disobedience to unjust laws, so far from subverting, tends directly to establish Law, by honoring the only true source of its claims. The only real upholder of Law is he who strenuously opposes all unjust enactments. That man who blindly or passively obeys all the behests of human rulers, right or wrong, merciful or cruel, is not the friend of Law, but of arbitrary rule, of tyranny.'

The citizens of Syracuse and Onondaga county did not, on the first of October, violate Law; they set at naught an unrighteous, cruel edict; they trampled upon tyranny.—Who doubts, who does not know, that if poor Jerry had been arrested for any crime, or only a misdemeanor—for the violation of property or the disturbance of the peace—who does not know that, if that had been the case, all the people would have said, Amen! so let it be! They would not have interfered in his behalf, even if, in his struggles against the executive officers, he brought upon himself a harsher treatment than his offence seemed to deserve.

But when the people saw a man dragged through the streets in a cart—chained and held down by four or five others, who had piled themselves upon him; when they saw him handled by the officers as if he were the worst of felons; and learned that it was only because he had assumed to be what God made him to be—a man, and not a slave; when this came to be known throughout the streets, there was a mighty throbbing of the public heart—an almost unanimous uprising against the outrage. There was little concert of action, except that to which a common humanity impelled the people. Indignation flashed from every eye. Abhorrence of the Fugitive Slave Bill poured in burning words from every tongue. The very stones cried out. Persons, who never before had been known to manifest the least interest in the cause of our enslaved countrymen, were loud in their cries of shame! shame! Democrats, as well as Republicans, yielded that day to the impulse of humanity, and joined with the Abolitionists in denouncing the deed.

Quickened, roused, urged on by this almost universal denunciation of the outrage upon freedom, some men, more ardent, less patient or cautious than the rest, broke through the partitions between the victim and his liberty, struck off the chains that bound him, and gave him a 'God-speed' to that country, where men-hunters dared not pursue him. Then such a shout of gladness rose upon the air as never made this welkin ring before. If that were sinful, than there were few if any saints in all our town that night. If that were treason, there were then few patriots here.

And, fellow-citizens, truth obliges us to confess, and we are so obdurate that we do confess without shame, that we have not yet repented of that transgression. Nay, we glory in it. We have given thanks for all attempts that have been made, in other parts of our country, to nullify the Fugitive Slave Act; and have rejoiced with joy unmeasured at every such attempt that has been success-

ful. On this day, the ninth anniversary of our triumph over injustice and cruelty, we solemnly declare that, so far as in us lies, that accursed enactment of our debauched General Government never shall be enforced in Central New York, nor in any other part of our State or Nation. And from this notorious spot, on this sacred day, we call upon our countrymen, throughout the free States, to unite with one accord to prevent the *Fugitive Slave Act* from ever being anywhere treated, or regarded, or spoken of, as the *law of the land*; and to withhold their votes from any candidate of either party, for any office, who will give his 'personal or official influence' to enforce obedience to this atrocious enactment.

LETTER FROM CHARLES SUMNER.

Boston, Sept. 9th, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:—You know well how much I sympathize with you personally, and also how much I detest the Fugitive Slave bill, as a flagrant violation of the Constitution, and of the most cherished human rights—as shocking to Christian sentiments, as insulting to humanity, and as impudent in all its pretensions. Of course, I agree with you that such an enactment, having no sanction in the Constitution, in Christianity or in reason, ought not to be allowed to remain on the statute book; and meanwhile, I trust that the honorable, freedom-loving, peaceful, good and law-abiding citizens, acting in the name of a violated Constitution, and for the sake of law, will see that this infamous counterfeit is made a *dead letter*. And I am happy to believe that all this can be accomplished by an aroused Public Opinion, which, without violence of any kind, shall surround every 'person' who treads our soil with all the safeguards of the citizen, and shall teach the slave-hunter, whenever he shows himself, that he must expect from Northern men no sympathy or support in his barbarous pursuit.

At your proposed meeting, which it will not be in my power to attend, I trust that a just hatred of slavery in all its pretensions will be subjected to that temperate judgment which knows how to keep a sacred animosity within the limits of the Constitution and the law.

Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me, and believe me, with much personal regard and constant sympathy,

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES SUMNER.

The Rev. S. J. MAY.

KIDNAPPING IN NEW YORK CITY.—A curious fugitive slave case has just come to light in this city. John Thomas, a colored man, recently owned by a Mr. Winter of Louisville, Ky., was sent by his master to an agent in Evansville, Ind., by whom he was shipped as a steward on a boat plying up and down the Ohio, his wages inuring to the benefit of Winter. John Thomas, tiring of his task, betook himself to Canada, and thence came to New York, where he engaged with Mr. Vail, in Broadway, as porter, serving him for some months. On Monday night, by some unexplained means, John Thomas was taken to the Grand Jury room in Chambers street, by some unknown personage. He managed to let Mr. Vail know his whereabouts, and on Tuesday that gentleman saw him there in the custody of some one, who exhibited a power of attorney from Winter to recover and return the fugacious John Thomas. Mr. Vail on Tuesday got a writ of habeas corpus, which Marshal Rynders yesterday responded to by producing in court the body of a John Thomas, colored man. This John Thomas, however, was another person, who had been in jail as a witness in a murder case since March last. The Judge decided that the writ was satisfied. Meanwhile Mr. Winter's John Thomas is probably far on his way to Louisville. But the fact remains that a man has been kidnapped in the streets of New York, confined in a U. S. court-room, and carried out of the State without the knowledge or connivance of U. S. Marshals, Deputies, Commissioners, District Attorneys, &c.—*Tribune*.

SPEECH OF JOHN HOSSACK,

CONVICTED OF VIOLATION OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW, BEFORE JUDGE DRUMMOND, OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CHICAGO.

May it please the Court: I have a few words to say why sentence should not be pronounced against me. I am found guilty of a violation of the Fugitive Slave law, and it may appear strange to your Honor that I have no sense of guilt. I came, sir, from the tyranny of the Old World when but a lad, landed upon the American shores, having left my kindred and native land in pursuit of some place where men of toil would not be crushed by the property-holding class. Commencing the struggle of life at the tender age of twelve years, a stranger in a strange land, having to earn my bread by the sweat of my brow, your Honor will bear with me, unaccustomed as I am to appear in Courts, much less to address them. I have feared that I might fail in bearing myself on this occasion worthy of the place and the position I occupy, and the great principles involved in the case before you. I say to your Honor, therefore, if I fail in observing the usual forms of the place, it will be from a want of judgment and error of the head, and not of the heart. Therefore I do not think I shall fare worse at the hands of your Honor, if I state plainly my views and feelings on the great question of the age—the rights of man. I feel that it is a case that will be referred to long after you and I have gone to meet the great Judge of all the earth.

It has been argued by the prosecution that I, a foreigner, protected by the laws of my adopted country, should be the last to disobey those laws; but in this I find nothing that should destroy my sympathy for the crushed, struggling children of toil in all lands.

Surely I have been protected. The fish in the rivers, the quail in the stubble, the deer in the forest, have been protected. Shall I join hands with those who make wicked laws, in crushing out the poor black man, for whom there is no protection but in the grave, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest?

It is true, sir—I am a foreigner. I first saw the light among the rugged but free hills of Scotland; a land, sir, that never was conquered, and where a slave never breathed. Let a slave set foot on that shore, and his chains fall off forever, and he becomes what God made him—a man. In this far-off land I heard of your free institutions, your prairie lands, your projected canals, and your growing towns. Twenty-two years ago I landed in this city. I immediately engaged on the public works, on the canal then building that connects this city with the great river of the West. In the process of time, the State failed to procure money to carry on the public works. I then opened a prairie farm to get bread for my family, and I am one of the men that made Chicago what it is to-day, having shipped some of the first grain that was exported from this city. I am, sir, one of the pioneers of Illinois, who have gone through the many hardships of the settlement of a new country. I have spent my best days, the strength of my manhood. I have eleven children who are natives of this my adopted country. No living man, sir, has greater interest in its welfare; and it is because I am opposed to carrying out wicked and ungodly laws, and love the freedom of my country, that I stand before you to-day.

Again, sir, I ought not to be sentenced because, as has been argued by the prosecution, I am an Abolitionist. I have no apologies to make for being an Abolitionist. When I came to this country, like the mass from beyond the sea I was a Democrat; there was a charm in the name. But, sir, I soon found I had to go beyond the name of a party in this country, in order to know anything of its principles or practice. I soon found that however much the great parties of my adopted country differed upon banks, tariffs and land questions, in one thing they agreed, in

trying which could stoop the lowest to gain the favor of the most cursed system of slavery that ever swayed an iron rod over any nation, the Moloch which they had set up, to which they offered as human sacrifice millions of the children of toil. As a man who had fled from the crushing aristocracy of my native land, how can I support a worse aristocracy in this land? I was compelled to give my humble name and influence to a party who proposed, at least, to embrace in its sympathies all classes of men, from all quarters of the globe. In this choice I found myself in the company of Clarkson and Wilberforce in my native land, and of Washington and Franklin, and many such, in this boasted land of the free; and, more than all these, the Redeemer in whom I humbly trust for acceptance with my God, who came to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, to set at liberty those who were bruised; yea, this very religion binds me to those in bonds as bound with them. Tell me, sir, with these views, can I be anything but an Abolitionist? Surely for this I ought not to be sentenced.

Again, sir, I ought not to be sentenced, because the Fugitive Slave law under which I am torn from my family and business by the subtle tools of the Slave Power, the slave-breeder and the slave-hunter, is at variance with both the spirit and letter of the Constitution. Sir, I place myself upon the Constitution in the presence of a nation who have the Declaration of Independence read to them every Fourth of July, and profess to believe it. Yea, in the presence of civilized man, I hold up the Constitution of my adopted country as clear from the blood of men, and from a tyranny that would make crowned heads blush. The parties who prostitute the Constitution to the support of slavery are traitors—traitors not only to the liberties of millions of enslaved countrymen, but traitors to the Constitution itself, which they have sworn to support. A foreigner upon your soil, I go not to the platforms of contending parties to find truth. I go, sir, to the Constitution of my country: the word slave is not to be found. I read, 'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice'—yes, sir, establish justice—to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.' These were the men that had proclaimed to the world that all men were created equal; that they were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and contended even unto death for seven long years. Can it be, sir, that these great men, under cover of those hallowed words, intended to make a government that should outrage justice and trample upon liberty as no other government under the whole heavens has ever done? This dreadful power that has compelled the great political parties of the country to creep in the dust for its power; that has debauched, to a large extent, the Christianity of the nation; that bids a craven priesthood stand with golden rule in hand, and defend the robbing of mothers of their babes, and husbands of their wives; that bids Courts decree injustice. Sir, I plant myself upon the Constitution, and demand justice and liberty, and say to this bloody Moloch, away! Sir, the world has never furnished so great a congregation of hypocrites as those that formed the Constitution, if they designed to make it the greatest slaveholder, slave-breeder, and slave-catcher on earth.—He is a great slaveholder that has a thousand slaves; but if this law is a true exponent of the Constitution, this Government, ordained for justice and liberty, holds four millions of slaves.

No, sir! no! for the honor of the fathers of my country, I appeal from the bloody slaveholding statute to the liberty-loving Constitution. While these fathers lived, State after State, in carrying out the spirit of the Constitution, put an end to the dreadful system. The great Washington, in his last will and testament, carried out the spirit of

the Constitution. But, sir, the law under which you may sentence me, violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. I have a word to say upon the articles of the Constitution which it is claimed the Fugitive Slave law is designed to carry out. 'No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on the claim of the party to whom such service or labor is due.' That is the provision that is claimed transforms the government into a monster of iniquity. I have read, over and over, that article interpreted by all laws of language known to a plain man. How these three or four lines can transform this government, ordained to secure justice, into a mean tool to aid the plunderers of cradles, the destroyers of homes, the ravishers of women and the oppressors of men, to carry on their hellish work—how it can do this thing, I cannot see. That article binds the several States separately not to pass a certain law, but where in it do we find a Fugitive Slave law? Where do you find a Commissioner? Where do you find that the government is to hunt up and return at its own expense a slave that flees from his cruel and bloody master? Where in those lines is the authority to compel me to be a partaker in the crimes of the man-stealer? The General Government is not once mentioned; but the States in their separate sovereignties are named. But, sir, this article expressly provides that the party making the claim shall have owed him service or labor due from the party claimed. If Jim Gray owed service or labor, or money, to Phillips, I am the last man in the world to raise my voice or hand to prevent Phillips, or any man, from obtaining their dues. What I would grant to the devil himself. I would not withhold even from the slaveholder—his due. Jim Gray claims that he does not owe Phillips a day's work or a dollar of money. Phillips claims that he owes him every day's work that has been deposited in his bones and sinews: yea, the toil of his body and mind both, till death shall end the period of stipulated toil. Here is a question for legal examination and judicial discussion. Does the man Gray owe this man Phillips anything? The Constitution is very clear and very plain in pointing out the way this question is to be settled.

Article — provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. That Jim Gray is a person, is admitted on all hands. Phillips admits it; the bloodhounds, marshals and attorneys that hunt him, say he is a person—a person held to service. The amount in dispute is the liberty and life-long toil of a man just entering into the full maturity of manhood. A great question lies between these men. But Gray, standing on soil covered by this Constitution, can be robbed of liberty, or the wages of his toil, only by due process of law.

Article — says, expressly, in suits at common law, when the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. Here, sir, is a case involving the question of liberty, and hundreds of dollars of money. The law, sir, under which I appear before you, overrides these plain provisions, and commits this whole question to one man, and offers him a bribe to trample right and liberty under foot. I know, sir, it may be said Jim Gray was a slave, and not entitled to these humane provisions. Had he never worn the chain of the oppressor, nor felt the lash of the bloody taskmaster—had he been born in Canada, or anywhere else on the globe—had he been a citizen of one of the States of this Union, and never been enslaved, it would have been all the same. His liberty would have been stricken down, and he been given to the party claiming his life-long toil, and your Commissioner would have pocketed the bribe offered by this law for doing such a crime against humanity and the plainest provisions of the Constitution.

No, sir; in a Court of the United States, while the Constitution provides for trial by jury, I ought not to be sentenced for raising my hand to rescue a fellow-man from a mob that would strip him of his liberty and life-long toil without due process of law, without trial by jury. Sir, this law tramples so flagrantly upon the spirit and letter of the Constitution, that I ought not to be sentenced.

Before passing from the Constitutional objections to this law, I would call the attention of your Honor to the partiality of the law, which is so at variance with the designs of the Fathers in organizing this government. No man can read the Constitution—in which the word slave cannot be found; from which the idea that a man could be reduced to a thing, and held as property, was carefully excluded—no man, I say, read that Constitution, and come to the conclusion that slavery was to be fostered, guaranteed and protected far beyond everything else in the country. Admit that Jim Gray was Phillips's property, how comes it that that particular property is more sacred than any other property? Phillips's horse escapes from him, and is found in a distant State; but the President of the United States, and every department of government, is not put on the track until the horse is found, and then return him to Phillips's stable, and then pay the whole bill from the national treasury. No, sir. But his slave escapes—he runs away, and, for some reason, his property in man is so much more holy and sacred, that the whole government is bound to take the track and hunt the poor, panting fugitive down, and carry him back to his chains and bondage at the government's expense.

Sir, under a Constitution unstained by the word slave, we have a law magnifying slave property above all other property in the nation—a law giving it guarantees that no other property could possibly obtain. Sir, the partiality of this law is so great, that it stands opposed to a Constitution that guarantees equal justice and protection to all.

John G. Fee is driven out of his Kentucky home, and robbed of the fruits of his life-long toil. There is no power to secure him his home, or protect him in his rights of property or opinion. But had John G. Fee only owned a slave, and his slave escaped, the government, under this law, would have followed his slave to the utmost limit of the United States, and returned his slave to him at its own expense. Your Honor will pardon me (if I need pardon,) but I cannot, for the life of me, see what there is in robbing a man of his inalienable rights and enslaving him for life, that should entitle it to the special and peculiar protection of national law.

I am aware, sir, that I shall be reminded that judges, marshals, attorneys and many citizens regard this law as constitutional, and stand ready to execute it, though it trample every principle of the Declaration of Independence in the dust. Sir, no law can be enacted so bad but that it will find men deluded or base enough to execute it. The law of Egypt that consigned the new-born babe to the slaughter found tools for its execution. The bloody decree of Herod found men ready to obey the law of the country, though it commanded the slaughter of the innocents of a province. Sir, tell me not of men ready and willing to execute the law. My Redeemer, whose name I am hardly worthy to speak, and yet whose name is all my trust, although he knew no sin, yet he was crucified by law.

Again, sir, it will be seen that some whom the world calls doctors of divinity and doctors of law, have undertaken to prove slavery was guaranteed by the Constitution. If that be so, in the name of the Most High God, tear out the red strip of blood; it was not written by the angel Gabriel, nor nailed to the throne of the Almighty. If slavery is in it, it is a covenant with death and an agreement with hell.

But, sir, I have one consideration more that I will urge why sentence ought not to be pronounced against me. This law, which I think I have proved outrageous to the rights of man, is so obviously at variance with the law

of that God who commands me to love Him with all my soul, mind, might and strength, and my neighbor as myself, and the Redeemer that took upon him my nature and the nature of poor Jim Gray, has been so particular in telling me who my neighbor is, that the path of duty is plain to me. This law so plainly tramples upon the divine law, that it cannot be binding upon any human being under any circumstances to obey it. The law that bids me do to other men as I would have other men do to me is too plain, too simple to be misunderstood. But, sir, I am now left to the general law of love in searching for my duty in this particular case. Permit me to refer your Honor to the oldest law book in existence; though it may not be in use in this Court, yet I think it better authority than Blackstone or any law book that ever was written. It is the Book of Books. In that book I find some special enactments given to the Hebrew commonwealth, that leave me in no doubt as to my duty in reference to this law. 'He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death.' Again, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that has escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him.' These plain statutes, with many more that I might give, leave me in no doubt as to the mind of the unchanging Jehovah, in reference to man-stealing and slave-hunting. Sir, the whole system of slavery originated in man-stealing, and is perpetuated by fraud and violence and plunder. Others may have their doubts as to their duty under this law; I, sir, have none. This law is just as binding on me as was the law of Egypt to slaughter Hebrew children; just as binding as the law that said, 'Worship the golden image, worship not God; just as binding as the law forbidding Christ and his apostles to preach the Gospel. Send me a law bidding me rob or murder my neighbor, I must decline to obey it. I can suffer, but I must not do wrong. Send me a law bidding me join hands in robbing my fellow-men of their freedom, I cannot do so great a wrong. Yea, send me a law bidding me stop my ears to the cry of the poor, I can suffer the loss of all these hands have earned, I can suffer bonds and imprisonment—yes, God helping me, I can give up my life, but I cannot knowingly trample upon the law of my God, nor upon the bleeding, prostrate form of my fellow-man. I go not to Missouri to relieve oppressed humanity, for my duty has called me nearer home; but when He that directs the steps of man conducts a poor, oppressed, panting fugitive to my door, and there I hear his bitter cry, I dare not close my ear against it, lest in my extremity I cry for mercy and shall not be heard. Sir, this law so flagrantly outrages the divine law that I ought not to be sentenced under it.

A single remark, and I have done. From the testimony (part of which is false) and from your rendering and interpretation of the law, the jury have found me guilty; yes, guilty of carrying out the great principles of the Declaration of Independence; yes, guilty of carrying out the still greater principles of the Son of God. Great God! can these things be? Can it be possible? What country is this? Can it be that I live in a land boasting of freedom, of morality, of Christianity? How long, oh, how long shall the people bow down and worship this great image set up in this nation? Yes, the jury say guilty, but recommend me to the mercy of the Court. Mercy, sir, is kindness to the guilty. I am guilty of no crime, I therefore ask for no mercy. No, sir, I ask for no mercy; I ask for justice. Mercy is what I ask of my God. Justice in the Courts of my adopted country is all I ask. It is the inhuman and infamous law that is wrong, not me.

My feelings are at my home. My wife and my children are dear to my heart; but, sir, I have counted the cost. I am ready to die, if need be, for the oppressed of my race. But slavery must die; and when my country shall have

passed through the terrible conflict which the destruction of slavery must cost, and when the history of the great struggle shall be candidly written, the rescuers of Jim Gray will be considered as having done honor to God, to humanity, and to themselves.

I am told there is no appeal from this Court, yet I do appeal to the court of high Heaven, when Judge Drummond and Judge Caton, the rescuer and the rescued, shall all have to stand at the judgment seat of the Most High.

I have, sir, endeavored to obey the divine law and all the laws of my country that do not conflict with the laws of my God. My humble wish is, that it may then appear that I have done my duty. All I wish to be written on my tombstone is, 'He feared God and loved his fellow-men.'

Our readers will be pleased to hear that this noble Scotchman, and Mr. Stout, have been liberated from prison—their fines having been paid by the citizens of Chicago.

SOUTHERN THUNDER—SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.

MARYLAND.

From the Border State, Baltimore.

The result does not surprise us; we felt that it would be so; we knew, as well as anything could be known before hand, that such would be the case; and we have not ceased to declare it boldly and fearlessly, as all know. Three short months ago we issued our *Border State*—a campaigner for Lincoln and Hamlin—amid the jeers and sneers of almost everybody in the city, at a time when there was not a hundred men who ventured to be known as Republicans. A little coterie, fearful and retiring, but watchful and prayerful, dared to hope that the dayspring would yet dawn upon us. The very boldness and audacity of our enterprise startled and amazed them. * * * Three cheers for Lincoln and Hamlin! the Constitution and the Union, one and inseparable, now and forever!

From the Baltimore Patriot, Nov. 8.

The people of this Union, which, for years has been convulsed and cruelly torn by the dissensions of the slavery agitation, has at last risen and thrown off the authors of its ills. The party which calls itself Democratic, and lived for years on the faith of the people in that name, as indicative of its defense of the rights of freedom and manhood, has been, by a just judgment, rent in twain, and the nation rejects it. It is weighed in the balance and found wanting. It had neglected the interest of the nation. It had descended from that high trust to the merest sectional conspiracy. It became itself a conspiracy against the rights and the feelings and the interests of the nation. The nation has risen in its own defense, and hurled it from power.—What an opportunity for him who can heal these wounds! We trust the man is chosen who will accomplish the nation's hope. We believe that day has come; we believe that man is chosen who can be prevented from accomplishing this *only by the Disunionists being permitted to carry out their threats*. And we believe it, because we believe what he says are his opinions. We do not believe what Disunion Democrats say are his opinions. We believe *his* statements; not their misrepresentations. We believe his truth; not their untruth.

From the Baltimore Clipper, Nov. 8.

The dangers to be apprehended now are from the South alone. Mr. Lincoln, although the candidate of an aggressive sectional party, will be unable to interfere with any Constitutional right of a Southern State, even if so desired. The Senate and the House of Representatives will be both opposed to him and his party. They will be a barrier to the execution of any scheme of Northern aggression that might be contemplated or attempted. His hands are tied, and he will be powerless in this respect. But the fire eaters in the South have threatened to refuse to submit to his Administration. The Hotspurs Wise and Yancey, and Rhett, the blue cockade reces-

sionists of South Carolina, and other flaming Disunionists here and there in the Cotton States have solemnly declared their intention to resort to open resistance to the inauguration of a President elected, at least, in accordance with the forms of the Constitution. It is from these, and these alone, that trouble is expected—but it is hardly possible that their disunion blustering will be approved or sanctioned by the masses of the Southern people.

From the Baltimore Republican.

The Black Republican fanatics have succeeded in electing a President holding their own sectional views—one whose great and only recommendation was, that he was bitterly hostile to a large portion of our countrymen, and insanely determined to trample upon their rights. For this reason, and for this purpose, Abraham Lincoln has been voted for by the North and West. But it is very doubtful, from present appearances, that he will ever be President of the United States. The probability is that before the time arrives for his inauguration, the Union will have been virtually dissolved, and a large portion of those States against which the Abolition war has been waged, will have determined not to submit to his sectional rule.

From the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 9.

The act of deliberate secession, and which has been ascribed to her as a thing of choice, will be, should the necessity ever occur, most repugnant to her. And it was to avert an apparent necessity which threatened her that the man, who of all others has been stigmatized as the embodiment of secession, [Yancey,] has within the past month or two, traversed the North, and made appeal after appeal to the reason, intelligence and patriotism of his fellow-citizens there; but, unfortunately, so far as the result is indicative, without avail.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

From the Washington Constitution.

We may be very treasonable, or very foolish, because we cannot entertain the opinion that Southern men are likely to accept Mr. Lincoln's election without murmur, complaint or remonstrance, yet, we confess that we cannot do so, and we believe, further, that we are not singular in our opinion. It will be terrible to receive the ignominious punishment of traitors with which one of our neighbors threatens us, and it is lamentable to feel that another pities our folly and want of common sense. Whoever charges us with recommending disunion states what he knows to be an infamous slander; and as we now solemnly assert that we shall never bid for Mr. Lincoln's patronage, there is no need for its repetition by those who seek to conciliate the President elect.

From the National Intelligencer.

As in the light of party madness at the South no man has assumed to impugn the loyalty of the Federal Judiciary as now constituted, and as it is ascertained that both branches of the Federal Legislature will be hostile to the Administration of Mr. Lincoln, it follows that the question of disunion, as based on the simple fact of a Democratic defeat in one branch of the Government, would imply, if carried, a deep-seated hostility to the Government itself, since even on the ground assumed for its destruction, no such necessity can possibly arise without involving the personal dishonor of men, whether in the halls of Congress or on the Judicial bench, are as far above reproach and fear in all that concerns the rights and welfare of their section as could be found in the most select confederation of 'Cotton States.'

From the Washington Star, Nov. 8.

Throughout the South the contest is to be clearly between revolution and anti-revolution; and in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky, if not Louisiana also, the revolutionists will not number one in five, even though it be attempted to aid their cause with the prestige of the Democratic party's name in those States.—North of Mason and Dixon's line there can be no such contest. In the Cotton States the success of the revolutionists is not impossi-

ble; but their success in them will, necessarily, number the Democratic party everywhere else among things only to be remembered, if its name becomes identified seriously with the scheme of revolution now sought to be carried.

DELAWARE.

From the Wilmington Journal.

Secession is not heard within the borders of this noble little State, or if it be spoken at all, it is only in connection with those feelings of scorn, derision and contumely, which it is sure to evoke from every manly and patriotic breast. No, no, Delaware will stand true to the Constitution at all hazards. Let South Carolina bluster. It is her nature to do so. In revolutionary times she was more tory than American; and the blood of insubordination seems to run through all her veins.—She is something like a pet child; the more she is coaxed, the more she becomes unruly.—A good spanking would benefit her greatly.

VIRGINIA.

From the Richmond Enquirer, Nov. 8.

It will be seen that the South Carolina Legislature is now engaged in considering the question of calling a State Convention, with the view of adopting measures for seceding from the Union and arming the State.—Other States will, doubtless, pursue a similar course. What will be the final result none but He who watches over the destinies of the world, and thus far has vouchsafed to us peace, prosperity, and happiness, can foretell. Let us hope for the best.—'Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.'

From the same, Nov. 19.

The Northern States which have declared war against us, and committed acts of war against us—they alone are competent to shield us from revolution. Let each Northern State, through her Legislature, or in Convention assembled, promptly repeal all nullifying laws passed for the injury of the constitutional rights of the South; pass laws to secure the easy and prompt execution of the Fugitive Slave Law; pass other laws imposing adequate penalties on all malefactors who shall hereafter assist or encourage the escape of fugitive slaves; pass other laws declaring and protecting the right of slaveholders to travel and sojourn in Northern States accompanied by their slaves; instruct their Senators and Representatives in Congress to repeal the law prohibiting the sale of slaves in the District of Columbia, and to pass laws sufficient for the full protection of slave property in all the Territories of the Union; and let those Senators and Representatives promptly obey such instructions.

From the Richmond Whig.

To suppose that a single State could withdraw at will, is to brand the statesmen of the Revolution, convinced of the weakness and certain destruction of the old confederation of the States, of laboring to perpetuate the evil they attempted to remedy. Their work, which has been the marvel of the world, would be no government at all; the oaths taken to support and maintain it would be bitter mockery of serious obligations, and nothing would exist to invite the confidence of citizens of strangers in its protection.

From the Norfolk Herald.

Any one in the least acquainted with human nature must see that those who have raised the whirlwind, the Northern States must themselves calm its violence—and allow them the opportunity, and, our word for it, they will do it. If they refuse, then it will be time enough for us at the South to do it, in our own way.

From the Richmond Dispatch.

Whatever is done, ought to be done without delay. Demagogues and persons have widened the breach between the two sections of the Union until it presents an awful chasm. The election of Lincoln, by such immense popular majorities, has diminished most painfully the hope of a revolution in public sentiment in the North. Yet the darkest hour is that just before the dawn of day, and it is

possible that the crisis now upon us is a precursor to a brighter day in the history of the Confederacy. Either such a day must soon shine upon the country, or the Union must be broken up into two or more Republics.—It cannot long survive the sectional partizany and hate that has raged so violently for the last few years.

From the Alexandria Gazette.

It turns out that a part of the present programme is separate State action, for the purpose of forcing or hitching other States to the tail of their kite. Their whole course is considered by many as dictatorial, arrogant, and insulting to the conservative Southern States, whose feelings and interests, we are afraid, they utterly disregard. Their conduct has already created a reaction in Virginia, even among citizens who formerly sympathized with them, or palliated or excused their disunion proclivities. Their rash and ill-considered proceedings are injuring the cause of the South in the eyes of the world abroad as well as at home. The more we reflect upon the subject, the more do we rejoice at the action of the Virginia Legislature, at its last session, in refusing their invitation, made upon the occasion of an invasion, by a band of murderers and fanatics, of our State.

NORTH CAROLINA.

From the Newborn Progress.

We say now, as we have said before, that the simple election of an objectionable man to the Presidency by a majority of the voters of the Republic, is no cause for breaking up the Government. Let us remain in the Union, and if we have to fight, fight for our rights under the same stars and stripes which have hitherto sheltered and protected us.

From the Raleigh Standard.

North Carolina will never permit Mr. Lincoln or his party to touch the institution of domestic slavery. Her people are at least a unit on this point. They may not advise or approve of secession, but they will not submit to the slightest indignity or the slightest encroachment at the hands of the Black Republican party. *Slavery in the States is in no danger.* Slavery can no more be limited by act of Congress than the Mississippi can be arrested in its course. It will spread to and take root in all new regions where the climate and soil demand it.

From the Wilmington Journal.

The election of Lincoln is a serious thing. It means all the insult for the present, and all the injury for the future, that such an act can do. We doubt if too gloomy or too serious a view can be taken of this event.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

From the Charleston Courier.

'It is time for action, not for words,' was the remark in relation to the memorable event of the 6th November, 1860, which determined the failure of the great American experiment of self-government, and compelled South Carolina to consider and arrange a new political relationship. The action has commenced, and some of its significant beginnings are now recorded in another place. They who have ignorantly or wantonly charged South Carolina with a vain desire for the place and post of leader in the great work of reconstruction and readjustment of Federal relations, or external relations, have erred as widely from the truth as those who derisively proclaimed that she could and would, undertake or dare no resistance of any kind to any aggressions or under any provocations. If the index of the dial-plate of Providence points to South Carolina as the leader selected by the natural course and issue of events, she cannot and will not shrink that position, be it one of honor, or only of inevitable danger. It is enough for her that it is one of duty.

From the Charleston News.

The South Carolina Flag.—This glorious flag now flies from many windows of buildings in our city, and we hope in a few days to see hundreds of them unfolding themselves over our heads. No one at the present time can gaze on the standard of our State with-

out feeling his heart swell with emotion, and his arm nerved and strengthened with a determination to stand by it to the last.

From the Charleston Mercury.

We commend to our readers the following letter to a gentleman of this city. It was written by a prominent and leading minister of the Baptist denomination, now a Professor in the South Carolina College. The view it presents is no less striking than true, and will address itself to the hearts and understandings of a great and influential class of readers. The fervid enthusiasm that animates our people finds a beautiful exemplification in this letter, and it will not diminish an earnestness and devotion to our cause to feel and believe that it has the sanction of religion as well as of patriotism:

Columbia, S. C., Nov. 14, 1860.

I am glad to find a coincidence of opinion between us. Like you, I have clung to our Union as associated with the blood and sufferings of our grandfathers. It was endeared by the reminiscences of the past, and cherished as the fruit of those toils which were narrated to us when children by our grandfather, who shared the perils and sacrifices of the Revolution. But it is no longer what it once was; and we should be false to our blood and our ancestral traditions if we were to submit to Black Republican rule. I am for immediate secession. My profession interdicts the use of arms, and I have no son old enough to offer to the Commonwealth, but all that I have is at her command. The sublimity of this great struggle kindles my imagination, and raises my heart. It is not simply a contest between different forms of civil polity or of civilization. It is the conflict between Divine revelation and human reason—between the Providence of God and the devices of man. Our institutions are scriptural, sanctioned by the practice of patriarchs and prophets, and the precepts of the Savior. The fanaticism that assails us is the product of infidelity, of rebellion against God, that presumes to be wiser than the Scriptures, and would substitute its disorganizing dogmas of liberty and equality for the conservative teachings of the New Testament. We Southern ministers are the only preachers who proclaim an unimpaired Bible. Northern ministers have suppressed or perverted its teachings, and dare not say—'Servants, be obedient to your own masters,' &c. In this view, the struggle upon which we have entered assumes the grandeur of a divine mission. We are the champions of God's truth, and he who falls in the contest will fall a 'blessed martyr.' How fortunate is it that our duty to our country coincides with our duty to God, and patriotism is sublimated into religion! I feel that God is with us.

ALABAMA.

From the Selma Sentinel.

We ask the people of Alabama to consider well upon these suggestions before they act. Let our young men who are full of blood, in the full vigor of manhood, and who are urging South Carolina to go out of the Union by herself, consider well what they are doing. Let them look well to the consequences of their course, and the results to follow such a course on the part of one State, or even two or three States.

From the Montgomery Advertiser.

Henceforth, the Government, with all its patronage and power, will be in the hands of the enemies of the Southern States. Henceforth, the Abolitionists will undertake to govern States. What will be the result? Look at St. Domingo.

From the Mobile Tribune.

The Governor of Mississippi made a speech last week. In speaking of the probable election of Lincoln, he told the people what he would do as the Chief Magistrate of the State. He said, 'that the same wire which conveyed the electric flash that brought the intelligence of Lincoln's election, the next instant should carry back his proclamation convening the Legislature of Mississippi, and he warned them now, if there were any members present, to be prepared to set out for the capitol of the State the next minute.'

GEORGIA.

From the Atlanta Confederacy.

Every Member of Congress representing a Southern constituency should resign at once.

Let us have nothing further to do with the Government until the eternal and everlasting question of Slavery is settled. If the South cannot settle it in the present Union, we can doubtless do so out of it. But it is her first duty to settle it if possible upon honorable and equitable principles in the Union.

From the Savannah Republican.

Mr. Hartridge of this city, in the House, and Mr. Sprayberry of Catoosa, in the Senate, have respectively introduced measures announcing a positive and immediate separation of Georgia from the Confederacy. This is a hasty step, and whatever may be the eventual resolve of the State, we have not thought that any considerable portion of the Legislature are now prepared to give it their support.

From the Atlanta Intelligencer.

Union is a very clever copartnership when the South can have equal rights and privileges, otherwise it is a curse, and secession becomes the glory and prosperity of the South. Peaceable secession will be the salvation and glorification of the South. Union and submission, without protection for our property, and without equal rights, will be ruin and destruction to the South. Let us be prepared to have our rights in the Union if we can, or out of it anyhow.

MISSISSIPPI.

From the Oxford Mercury.

We must put our house in order. The day for arguing the question of slavery with the North has passed. We hope that no Southern man will ever again enter into a discussion with any one North as to whether slavery is right or wrong. We will hereafter tell them: 'These negroes are ours, and the moment you lay hands upon them your life shall pay the forfeit.' That is the way to stop aggression. We have fulfilled every Scriptural demand of forbearance. To forbear longer will be a violation of the Scriptures. To advocate the Union now is to advocate the humiliation of the South. Some men hold the Union high above and paramount to everything else. True it is a valuable heritage, and would be priceless were it not perverted to unholy purposes.

From the Vicksburgh Whig, Nov. 16.

It may be safely set down that Louisiana will not secede, even if any foolish attempt is made to test the question. The Douglas and Bell vote united beats Breckinridge out of sight; and a large proportion of those who supported Major Breckinridge are as strong Union men now as they were during the canvass, when they all professed to be Union men. No matter what other States may do, the Mississippi Valley will stand by the Union as our fathers gave it to us. Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas and Louisiana will not secede! Mark that.

LOUISIANA.

From the New Orleans Courier.

Of one thing, however, the whole South may rest assured—that the sons of Louisiana will not remain indifferent spectators of the drama about to be enacted, and if the sword is to be drawn, they will not be found in the vanguard of the Southern phalanx. There has been already too much blustering. When the time for action arrives, let it be the result of calm councils, sound judgment, and patriotic feeling.

From the Oxford Mercury.

From all portions of the South we hear the notes of preparation for the coming storm—The reveille is being beat, minute men, riflemen and dragoons are forming, and making ready to march at a moment's warning to repel the foe and assist the people of any of the States in throwing off the thralldom of Black Republicanism and asserting their freedom. We are treading on times of the utmost moment. The North will find, in less than six months, that the blood of the South has been aroused to resistance, and that their odious abolition principles cannot be carried into effect before a sea of blood shall have first sprinkled the ground.

TEXAS.

From the Houston Telegraph.

We are satisfied of one thing. If Texas goes out of the Union, her people will be as one man when she does go. Once established in independence, this State will become the nucleus of slavery, and the harbor of the wealth attached to slavery on this continent.

TENNESSEE.

From the Memphis Appeal.

The Palmetto State has postponed the holding of her Convention, very fortunately, we think, for the country, until the second Monday in February, 1861. Alabama will be compelled by the legislative resolutions of February last, to act within forty days of the time that the Electoral College holds its meeting and votes for the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, as required by the Federal Constitution. Mississippi will, doubtless, order, through her Legislature, which is soon to convene, in accordance with Governor Pettus's proclamation, a Convention of the people within a like reasonable period. We candidly believe that a fair discussion of the issue presented before the Southern people at present, if properly pressed, will result in the determination to demand their rights in this Union, and to exact the use of Federal power in enforcing them.

From the Nashville American.

While we are for the Union, we cannot indorse the sentiment which we have seen upon some of the political transparencies during this canvass: 'The Union, right or wrong.' We are for the Union 'right,' and would be willing to suffer much wrong in it, but we cannot say that we would submit to every wrong that fanaticism and power might feel disposed to inflict upon us.

From the Memphis Bulletin.

The rumors which reach us of the hasty and precipitate action of South Carolina, in taking steps to go out of the Union, made a profound impression. The general voice is in condemnation of such a course.

KENTUCKY.

From the Louisville Courier.

The times are full of danger. To guide the ship of State safely through the perils that surround it, requires wisdom, prudence, firmness, courage, patriotism, and the soundest statesmanship. Whether those who are to control our destiny are equal to the dreadful emergency is the question which deeply concerns every American citizen, and on the solution of which depends the hopes of the people of the whole country.

From the Covington Journal.

If the people of the North persist in violating those provisions of the Constitution which were intended to guard the rights of the South, the people of the South must do one of three things: 1. Retaliate; 2. Submit; 3. Secede from the Union.

From the Bowling Green Sentinel.

If you, Northern men, love the Union, give us assurance of that love by a speedy repeal of your unconstitutional and obnoxious laws, and, our word for it, the trouble will pass away. Until then, cease the pharisaical hypocrisy which professes a stronger regard for the Union and the Constitution than we of the South possess.

MISSOURI.

From the St. Louis Democrat.

The true remedy for the excitement which prevails in a portion of the country will be found in Mr. Lincoln's own utterances and declarations. Throughout the campaign just closed, he has been portrayed by most of the newspapers and stump speakers of the anti-Republican factions as an Abolitionist; a fanatic of the John Brown type; the slave to one idea, who, in order to carry that out to its legitimate results, would override laws, constitutions and compromises of every kind, nor shrink, if necessary, from overturning the whole fabric of society, like another Robespierre. Never was a public man so outrageously misrepresented.

